THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

FOURTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(XXXVII).—SEPTEMBER, 1907.—No. 3.

CONDITIONS AND LIMITS OF DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT.

"LET the intelligence, the knowledge, the wisdom of the whole Church, as well as of individuals, grow from more to more in the succession of the ages, but in conformity with its own type, that is, in the same doctrine, the same sense, the same mind." These words of Vincent of Lerins, describing the law of development of doctrine, were employed by the Vatican Council when it was asserting the immutability of Catholic truth and of the creed; and some time after the Council a dispute arose between the editors of two Catholic reviews, both men equally able and learned, both equally famous for devotion to the authority of the Church and to the Holy See, both men who had sacrificed great worldly prospects in order to enter the true Church, over the question whether the Council had or had not defined the principle of Development. The dispute, of course, really turned on the meaning of the term "define," as applied to conciliar action respecting doctrine; and, without saying that the principle was "defined," we may say that it was recognized and affirmed.

The reason for the law of development in the doctrines and institutions of the Church was never more clearly expressed than by a representative Jesuit philosopher and theologian, the contemporary of Bacon and Campanella. "It is natural to man," writes Suarez, "to proceed from the imperfect to the perfect, and to advance gradually; and thus there is usually greater wisdom in the old. Now, God adapts grace

to nature. Therefore it is probable that he has so enlightened the world and the Church." Readers of Romanes's *Thoughts on Religion* must have been struck by his confession that the theory of evolution, which first led him away from religion, led him back again to Theism and toward Christianity, as it furnished the best explanation of the history of religion; and *A Modern Pilgrim's Progress* tells us how that theory helped the author "to see in the growth and evolution of the Catholic Church a sign that it was formed by the same God who made the material world."

The principle of development was, of course, familiar to the Fathers. "Proficit Ecclesia sapientia et aetate," is a saying of Hilary.[1] "The more the world is drawn out toward the end," says St. Gregory the Great, "the more widely the entrance of heavenly knowledge (*aeternae scientiae*) is opened unto us." I find him quoted by Suarez[2] as saying: "The Holy Spirit teaches His Church by degrees." St. Augustine frequently recognizes the principle, and his practical recognition of it is even more striking than his theoretical; for he assuredly developed much of our theology. Gregory of Nazianzus is the one among the Fathers who would allow it the largest scope. But if Vincent of Lerins seems to take a view less broad than that of Gregory, we must allow for their respective positions: while Gregory was dealing with the opponents of a true development, Vincent was opposing what he considered to be a false development and a perversion, and consequently he is led to insist more upon tradition and the need of early appearance as a test of truth (*Quod semper*). They were dealing with contrary errors, and therefore they emphasized opposite aspects of the principle.

The increase of religious knowledge within the Church is no purely scientific process, for it is the work not of the speculative reason alone, but chiefly of the moral reason, and

[1] *Cf.* Gospel of St. Luke, 3: 52.

[2] The reference given by Suarez is *Hom. 26 in Ezechiel.* This, of course, is wrong. I have not been able to trace the quotation (*Spiritus S. paulatim suam Ecclesiam docet*). Some one else may be more fortunate.

it is due almost as much to the devotion of the simple faithful as to the reflection and discussions of theologians. Nor is it a purely natural process; for it sets out from principles supernaturally given and supernatural in their character; it terminates, in the case of each question, in a decision by a Teacher who has the supernatural guidance which the risen Redeemer promised to His Apostles; and it is assisted by divine grace and the inspirations of the Holy Ghost in the course of the long travail of thought which intervenes between the opening of a discussion and the final settlement by the infallible authority.

It is almost a truism to say that as there always have been some to oppose true and wise progress in religious knowledge, so there always have been some whose attempts to advance beyond the truths already recognized have taken a wrong direction and have incurred censure from an authority wiser than man. Attempts have repeatedly occurred in the history of the Church to assert that new revelations of divine truth may be given. The Montanists furnish us with an example of a sect founding itself upon a claim to a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit and new revelations beyond "the faith once delivered to the Saints." Tertullian [3] endeavored to propagate a theory that would cover their case. Asserting, truly enough, that as everything in nature ripens gradually, so also does religion, he went on to distinguish four stages and eras: the first, that of natural religion, when it was *in rudimentis;* the second, that of infancy, under the Law and the Prophets; the third, that of hot youth, under the Gospel (*per evangelium efferbuit in juventutem*); and last, that of sober manhood under the reign of the Holy Spirit (*nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem*). It is impossible to repress a smile when we find the extravagances of the Montanist "prophets" described as manly soberness in comparison with the juvenile fervor of the Apostolic Church; but the African Puritan of the second century was not behind the Puritan of the seven-

[3] *De Veland. Virgin.*, 1.

teenth century in presumption and self-deceit. Tertullian had no thought of adding to the articles of the Creed; but his theory altogether subverted the authority of the Custodian of the Creed and exposed her to endless schisms by substituting the rule of self-appointed "prophets" for that of the Apostolic Succession. And, therefore, while imagining that he was opening his mind to new truth, he was really denying the truths contained in the article concerning "the Holy Catholic Church."

The prophecies of Abbot Joachim in the twelfth century, or rather his interpretations of Scripture prophecies, and especially of the Apocalypse, were full of the notion of an epoch when the reign of the Son should come to an end, and be succeeded by a kingdom of the Holy Ghost, in which the Sacrifice of the Mass would cease, and the secular clergy be abolished, and contemplative monasticism would fill the Church and regenerate the world. In our own days, in some quarters in Italy, something like this fancy of a reign of the Holy Spirit, in which the Visible Church will be a superfluity, has been invented or revived. The millenial dreams of many of the early Christians are, perhaps, another example of the same extravagance. Such notions, of course, in whatever form they may appear, do not deserve the name of development. Even were such a theory as true as it is false—even were such an epoch as possible as it is impossible—still such a change would not be a development but a spiritual "new creation."

On the other hand, there have not been wanting people to deny the possibility of development altogether. The Protestants, who to-day have learned—or at least the "Liberal" portion of them—to talk so glibly about it, once opposed it altogether. A Protestant theologian of the sixteenth century, replying to a Catholic who had asserted that there was a development in the early Church, exclaimed: "O caeci! Christi lex aeterna est, et non indiget maturatione temporum ut stabilitatem consequatur." It was not until they had to encounter Bossuet's overpowering assault upon their varia-

tions, that Jurieu bethought himself of a theory of change, the very contrary of which he himself had up to that time maintained. The Anglican High Church party asserted a narrow and rigid interpretation of Vincent's dictum *Quod semper, quod ubique, et quod ab omnibus.* Inside the Church, the Gallican school were distinguished for their hostility to the principle of development and their approximation to the Anglican position.

Sixty or seventy years ago the development of doctrine had been so boldly denied by some Catholic theologians and so little asserted by others, that a Protestant of such honesty and intelligence, and so near to the Catholic religion, as Brownson, could reproach the Church, not indeed with opposing, but with not asserting the principle, and with the appearance of opposition to religious progress. "She has left it to be believed," he said, "that the Gospel, instead of being given merely in germ to be subsequently developed and applied, was given her as a perfect code drawn out in all the minuteness of detail, and that her sole mission is to preserve the original deposit, unaltered, undiminished, unenlarged." The Catholics were, in his opinion, infected with the Protestant spirit "which subjects the Church to antiquity . . . and seeks to keep or carry the Christian world back to the very point from which it started." "The true theory is, I believe, that through all the successive stages of its existence the Church is apostolic, retaining always and everywhere the same authority over faith and discipline which the Apostles themselves had, and that its mission is not merely to preserve the *memory* of a work done, *completed*, but to *continue* and carry on to perfection a work commenced. . . . Its mission is the continued evolution and realization in life of the truth contained in the principles of the Christian dispensation; which continued evolution and realization constitute the continued progress of mankind." Strange to say, a Catholic magazine entered into controversy with him, assumed that development was an uncatholic idea, boldly denied that there had been any development of doctrine in the past, and maintained that in the true

Church there ought not to be, and could not be, any development of doctrine *because* a religion given by God must be perfect from the beginning; as if life and the power of growth were not perfections. Brownson, partly from his own reflections and partly from the force of these arguments, became a Catholic under the impression that the principle of development was false and uncatholic, and he continued to maintain in the pages of his *Review* that it was totally wrong, even when Perrone was teaching it in the center of Catholicism, and publishing it with the sanction of authority, and incorporating it in the terminology of Papal Bulls.

It is curious that while Brownson had been reproaching the Church with indifference or aversion to the principle of development, Palmer, the great Anglican champion, was reproaching "modern defenders of Romanism" because they held that theory—"the principal difference," he says, "between the system of Rationalists and that of the philosophical Romanists alluded to being that the latter attribute to the Church that office of development which the former assign to the reason of individuals"—a very wide difference, surely.

The Catholic principle of development stands in the centre between a mechanical fixity and a changeability governed by no law and not true to the past. It is the destiny of Catholic truth and of Catholic authority to be assailed alternately, or simultaneously, by contrary extremes. The faith combines in a mysterious union truths beset by contrary heretical tendencies, and denied by opposite errors. It lies, for example, between the Ebionite and the Docetist, between the Nestorian and the Monophysite, between the Pelagian and the Manichaean (or the Calvinist, or the Jansenist). "Semper Christus inter duos latrones crucifigitur." And on this question, likewise, the Catholic principle is found between such assertion of rigid identity as would exclude all progress, and such assertion of progress as would destroy the immutability of truth and the identity of the Creed from first to last. The medieval idea of development arising in an age not only ignorant of history but beset with historical fictions and for-

geries, was inevitably narrow. Much as we reverence the Scholastics in philosophical theology, and in all questions which can be settled by deductive methods, the case is different with questions whose treatment requires a knowledge of history. The only point on which, so far as I remember, they admitted a real development was the form of Baptism. The narrow medieval conception of the scope of development long embarrassed theologians. Suarez, I think, is the first who tried to modify St. Thomas's view. But the final deposition of the Scholastic conception, and the rise of a view in accordance with that of the Fathers, is marked by the substitution of the term *Evolutio* instead of *Explicatio*. The Bull *Ineffabilis*, dogmatically defining the Immaculate Conception, makes an express reference to the development of doctrine. When the Bull was being drawn up, Perrone and the theologians associated with him employed the word *evolvere* instead of *explicare*, which had been in use since the thirteenth century. The Holy Father accepted the new term for an old truth. But some of the bishops then assembled in Rome objected that the view expressed by the term *Evolutio doctrinae* was not in accordance with that generally prevalent in the schools; and the Pope, doubtless for the sake of unanimity, deferred for this occasion to the objection. No one heard the news with more delight than Brownson. During the course of the next ten or fifteen years it became clear that the view of Perrone and Newman was really a return to the Patristic principle; and the Bull summoning the Vatican Council declares that, throughout the history of the Church, councils have been convoked "ad Catholicam . . . *evolvendam* doctrinam." And the Council itself, while affirming the immutability of Catholic doctrine when once declared by the Church, affirmed the principle of development in the words of Vincent of Lerins, some of which we have cited at the head of this article. The book most often used at the Council was Newman's *Essay on Development*.

Even within the limits of a development, there may occur on the part of the theologians a false application of the prin-

ciple. A change which in its extent does not go beyond the bounds assigned to development, may nevertheless be in a wrong direction. If it be a change in theological opinion, it may so exaggerate one of the propositions composing a mystery as to obscure or deny one or more of the others. If it be an institutional change, it may tend to overset the balance established by the divine law. On the question of the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, St. Cyprian and his supporters, setting themselves (as they acknowledged) against the *consuetudo*, and claiming to have received greater light upon the subject from reason and from the inspirations of the Holy Ghost, so exaggerated the exclusiveness of the Church and the need of actual membership as to deny another truth. They were checked by the Pope of the day, who called upon them to return to *quod traditum est*, and laid down the law *nihil innovetur, i. e.*, as Vincent says in a more diffuse explanation, that the past may not be reversed. The Pope appealed to Apostolical Tradition, and though that, by being expanded and developed, may receive the appearance of addition, yet what is once recognized cannot be declared false. The new view had probably infected the majority of the Church when the Pope interfered; but the universal consent since has agreed with the tradition of the Roman Church to which he appealed.

Another and a similar example of a wrong development, as theologians are now generally agreed, is found in the theory of predestination and grace put forward by some of the opponents of Pelagius. Their just abhorrence of that soul-destroying heresy caused them to fall into a disproportionate, unsymmetrical, and one-sided development of the mystery of divine sovereignty and human freedom. It was against this development, which was in fact a perversion, that Vincent was aiming in his *Commonitorium*. It continued to float in the schools through the Middle Ages. In the fifteenth century a devout Scholastic, one of the finest of the Scotists, and therefore with little liking for it, consoles us with the reflection: "Sive salvet, sive damnet, semper creaturae suae com-

putati sumus apud Eum." [4] The dangerous tendencies of the theory were not realized until the rise of Calvinism. The controversy with that heresy opened the eyes of Catholics to the need of asserting the other part of the mystery of grace. The Society of Jesus, by establishing a distinction between predestination to grace and predestination to glory, and between predestination to the body of the Visible Church and predestination to grace, and by emphasizing human responsibility and freedom, restored the true balance and symmetry to the Christian doctrine of grace. After a long dispute, and the appointment of a special commission, or *Congregatio de Auxiliis,* their doctrine obtained full recognition. The condemnation of Jansenism brought out the judgment of the Church upon many points; and the opinion which has the greater favor in the Schools to-day is not that which had the greater favor in the Middle Ages. So, too, at one time the opinion contrary to the Immaculate Conception seemed to be prevailing; St. Bernard and St. Thomas thought they were following the mind of the Church; and Scotus spoke hypothetically: "*Si* auctoritati Ecclesiae vel Scripturae non repugnet, videtur *probabile* quod excellentius est attribuere Mariae." Petavius remarks: "Antiquioribus placuit illa opinio; postea tamen in contrariam partem [favoring the doctrine] complures iere Christiani; ac paulatim tacito assensu percrebruit," etc.

Again, we find in the Middle Ages an exaggerated and one-sided development of temporal power for the Church and of a duty for the State of religious persecution. Such theories have been since repudiated by the Church; they had, in fact, been practically abandoned everywhere except in Spain when the violence and lawlessness of the Protestant "Reformers" brought in the use of force again. Even in the Middle Ages Scotus taught that the Fifth Commandment forbids the infliction of capital punishment except in cases where

[4] Lychetus, Comment, in Scot. Lib. I, Sentent., d. xli, q. unic. The whole passage will repay perusal.

the Word of God authorizes an exception. The inference from this principle he did not draw out, not in words at least; but remembering the dislike which Irish Catholics have always felt for religious persecution, we can scarcely doubt that he meant that the inference should be drawn by others. The theory of the duty of persecution has now so faded away that Catholics in general do not know that it ever was held; to our present instincts it is so repugnant, and it seems so alien from Patristic interpretation of our Lord's teaching, that even historical evidence can scarcely convince us that it ever flourished.[5]

So, too, the attitude of theologians toward the heliocentric astronomy in the time of Galileo indicates an unbalanced and one-sided development of the doctrine of the authorship of the Scriptures, a development which was moving away from the Patristic tradition in the direction of the Protestant idea; for we must not forget that Luther, three-quarters of a century earlier, and the founder of Methodism a century after the time of Galileo, pronounced the heliocentric astronomy contrary to the Word of God. It were well, in truth, if the case of Galileo were forgotten by all but theologians; *we* ought to remember it that it may remind us that, while we are not bound to know what is true or false in the secular sciences, we are bound to know what is or is not theologically allowable. Theological opinion has long moved away from that position. The Jansenists, who were so like Protestants, made it one of their charges against the Jesuits: "Vouloir reconnaître dans l'Écriture quelque chose de faiblesse et de l'esprit naturel de l'homme." The principles of the Fathers seem to be sufficient to enable us to deal with the facts or probable hypotheses of history and criticism; and it seems likely that on this question the Dominicans and the Sulpicians may render as great services to the cause of religious knowledge as the Jesuits did on the question of grace, as the

[5] See Gratian, Decret. Pars 2ª, causa XXIII, q. V, c. xlvii (*De Homicidio*), Migne, Patr. Lat., 187, 1234.

Franciscans and Jesuits did on the question of the Immaculate Conception, and as the Dominicans and Jesuits did on the question of Papal prerogatives. Meanwhile, happily for us, the process of development goes on, under the supervision of a Teacher wiser than any theologian, than any School, than any Order; who will one day speak the final word.

Outside of the Church, attempts at progress in theology prove to be destructive, not constructive. It is only within the true Church, under the guidance of the living Authority which our Redeemer has set up for us, that progress can be conservative, and conservativism progressive. Where there is life there must be growth. It is the game of Liberals to pretend that Liberalism is the only progress, that progress and Liberalism are identical; and we should be playing their game if we were to say that Conservativism is exclusive of progress. Indeed, the word *conservative* has come to have two meanings: sometimes it means the opposite of Radical or of Destructive; and sometimes it means, in a worse sense, the opponent of all change, good or bad, constructive or destructive—the opponent of progress upward as well as of progress downward. So the word *liberal*, which when spelled with a small *l*, means broad-minded and large-hearted, means when it is spelled with a capital *L* the opponent of the principles of authority, dogma, tradition, and union; and such opponents are often illiberal enough. Conservativism has always had many adherents simply opposed to all change; but it always has had, and by the grace of God always will have, many who have such a grasp of the principles of dogma, tradition, authority, and union, that they will be able to carry the old truths forward to new developments, and to incorporate the new truths of history and science and criticism, in their proper place, into the ancient system "once delivered to the Saints."

Since the sixteenth century, theologians have been endeavoring to determine the conditions and modes of development. Suarez, as I have said, differed from St. Thomas, and questioned his view that those who lived nearest to the time of

our Lord had the most light and most knowledge of Christian doctrine. He deals at length with development both in his treatise *De Fide* and in his commentary on the *Summa* (p. 3, q. xxvii, art. 2), and beautifully cites in favor of the principle the verse of Proverbs (4: 18): *The path of the just as a shining light goeth forward and increaseth unto the perfect day*, applying to the whole Church the analogy of the change from dawn to sunrise and from sunrise to full day. The development, for instance, of the doctrine of the Divinity of the Son, ending in the enforcement of the term *homoüsion*, seems to be little more than a development in form and expression, and in negation of contrary errors; for surely there is no doubt that our Lord, from the foundation of the Church, was worshipped with divine worship, as being one with the Father. Yet Petavius, when he asserted development in this doctrine, had to endure the attacks of Gallicans, and it was his foreboding of this that accounts for the apologetic character of his preface, which some have treated as a retractation of the theory laid down in his book. The development in the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost is greater than in the doctrine concerning the Son. Gregory of Nazianzus speaks of this almost as a new revelation; and it is to be noted that both Petavius and Perrone cite his words without qualification or restriction, and therefore may be supposed to hold his view as to the wide scope of development possible even in an article of the Creed. If again, we take the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, that may be regarded as a development of the doctrine of the Blessed Virgin's sinlessness; and *that*, as a development or consequence of the doctrine that she was "Theotocos"; and that, again, is a development of the expression of the article of the Creed, *Born of the Virgin Mary*. Cardinal Fisher, in his *Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio*, in reference to Indulgences, indicates certain principles. He says that many things unknown in the primitive Church have come to be subjects of question and doubt and to be cleared up by the diligence of later times. He points out that the doctrine of Indulgences could not have

arisen until after that of Purgatory; and Purgatory was "aliquamdiu incognitum, deinde quibusdam pedetentim," and at length generally received, "non absque maxima Spiritus dispensatione." And when the doctrine of Purgatory was developed, then people began to reflect how they might escape its pains; and then they came to perceive that in the power of binding and loosing granted to Peter there was latent the power of granting Indulgences. So, too, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, he says, "Nullâ preceptorum vi sed consensu quodam tam populi quam cleri sensim *irrepsit;*" and he vindicates it on the authority of the *sensus fidelium* which is under the influence, he points out, of the Holy Spirit. Alphonsus de Castro, a theologian who attended the Council of Trent, remarks that "multa sunt posterioribus nota quae vetusti illi scriptores prorsus ignoraverunt;" and so also "non dubito," he boldly says, "quin etiam multa sint a posteris clarius et apertius invenienda, quae nobis sunt prorsus nunc ignota." Perrone's chapter on Development in his work on the Immaculate Conception and Newman's later edition of his *Essay* furnish us with the best analysis, so far, of the conditions and laws of development. Doubtless their view is susceptible of improvement in the way of expansion or of correction in some points. Our idea of development must itself develop. It is only a Hegel who can think that an eternal process of thought can terminate in fixity in his own system. But I think their view has more approval from authority than any other.

The historical movement of the present century has done much service to the principle of development by proving the fact and by furnishing data for the discovery of the law. But it has its danger. Historians as well as theologians must remember that they are subject to the teaching authority of the Church. Every one writes history with a theory—a "philosophy of history," avowed or implicit. The Church has at least as much right to have a theory about her own past as any one else. Seriously, she, by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, knows with a supernatural instinct what she has

been and shall be, from first to last. Even her theologians, though they have not the gift of infallibility, may aid the historians in the interpretation of facts, as much as the historians can aid the theologians by furnishing facts by which to test theories. We shall probably be often enough provoked in the years to come with the extravagances of extreme evolutionists in theology in France and Italy. To allow ourselves to recoil into the contrary extreme would be to imitate their error. Contraries are those things which *maxime distant in eodem genere.* Disputants are often *in eodem genere*—both extremists, and therefore both in the wrong. Even within more reasonable limits, we must be prepared for great varieties of opinion; but we need not, after the fashion of politicians, impute bad motives or evil tendencies to those who differ from us. Zeal is a good servant but a bad master. And there are many in the Church, says St. Gregory the Great, who from unwise zeal "dum quosdam quasi hereticos insequuntur, haereses faciunt; illis quippe sunt similes de quibus scriptum est: *Aemulationem Dei habent sed non secundum scientiam.*" The questions which lie before us in the coming years will require all the mutual charity and equity and patience and love of truth above party of which human nature is capable, and even then

> Will thirty seasons render plain
> Those lonely lights, that still remain
> Just breaking over land and main?

"God is patient, because He is eternal." His Church is patient, too.

When I remember how much opposition and censure Perrone and Newman had to endure, from Gallicans opposed on principle to development, and from Medievalists who would allow only an *Explicatio* or Unfolding, I confess I am slow to censure those who would modify the theory of Perrone and Newman. Let us leave condemnation to authority, and let us try to remember that our reasonings in theology can be little better than hypotheses until they have received con-

firmation from some authority higher than our own private judgment. In the face of a hostile world — our common enemy — triumphant in France, defeated in England and in Germany—it would be well to think how small are our differences compared with the common interests of the Faith and of the Church; and to try to work together in sympathy and confidence in solving the very grave problems in the history of dogma and in Biblical criticism which will keep us busy in the years to come. The history of past development will become all the more luminous, the development of the future will proceed all the more smoothly, if we constantly remember how fallible each one of us is, and if we never forget that there is an authority over us all who speaks as the Vicar of Christ.

M. J. RYAN.

St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

THE REFORM OF THE BREVIARY.

"Quid aptius ad Deo debitum cultum honoremque persolvendum? aut quid ad excitandam fidelium pietatem accomadatius . . . quam illa ecclesiasticarum precationum institutio, sive publice sive privatim recitandae sint . . . quarum obligatio si nonnullis durior videtur et morosior, timendum est, ne id ex divinarum rerum taedio et fastidio oriatur. . . . Nihil itaque Dei ministris convenientius institui poterat quam illarum precum scilicet Psalmorum, Lectionum S. Scripturae, Orationum seu Collectarum Breviarium, si modo a nimia prolixitate et ab incertis historiis sit purgatum. Id pro sua providentia identidem curarunt summi Pontifices, emendando Breviarium Romanum, quod aliorum exemplum esse debeat." Mabillon, *De Cursu Gallicano*, Disq. 75-77.

THE Breviary serves a twofold purpose. First, it is intended for the praise and honor of God. The Psalms and Hymns and Prayers which it contains are plainly meant for this end. But there is another purpose, which we sometimes overlook. When we say our Office, not only do we speak to God, but He also speaks to us. A large portion of it consists of readings from the Holy Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, and the Lives of the Saints. It is in these latter that He tells us what He would have us believe and do,

setting before us not only doctrines and precepts, but also examples. Each day, then, as we perform our sacred task, we join with our brethren and religious Sisters, whether in choir or in private, in sounding God's praises and in listening to His instructions. And in doing this, we are not only united with them to-day in every land, but we are also carried back in spirit right through the Christian centuries, and even long centuries before when these same Psalms and Readings were in use among the devout worshippers of God. Nay more, we are lifted up to those choirs of heavenly spirits who cease not day and night to give Him glory and honor and benediction:

Sed illa sedes Coelitum
Semper resultat laudibus,
Deumque Trinum et Unicum
Jugi canore praedicat:
Illi canentes jungimur
Almae Sionis aemuli.

It would be indeed a work of love to point out the beauties and riches contained in this Divine treasure. But my business here is the less pleasing one of noting its defects and venturing (with no little trepidation) to suggest some remedies. No doubt there are many excellent priests who will allow no fault in the book which has been their companion for many a year; and others again who, admitting its defects, despair of any remedy for them. To both of these classes the following paper is addressed.

I.

The Divine Office may be likened to some vast pile of buildings whose foundations date back even to the days of the Old Law. In its main lines it belongs to Patristic times; but successive additions and alterations have so changed its character that these can now hardly be recognized. Many of the original portions of it, fashioned on a grand scale in the style of a by-gone age, are hardly ever used; whereas the later additions being smaller and more convenient have taken their place. At times, however, excursions have to be made into

the older part; and on these occasions much confusion is caused in passing back and forth from the one to the other. Serious attempts have been made to destroy either the earlier or the later portion; and permission has been obtained to restrict the use of the former to the very rarest occasions. The time seems to be approaching when a serious effort will be made to restore this portion to its former prominence, and to remove the excrescences and accretions which interfere with the harmony of the whole.

1. The most ardent admirer of the Breviary will hardly deny that in its present state it is extremely complicated. Nearly four hundred years ago the clergy complained that it took as long to find the Office as to say it. Much more is this the case now when so many fresh feasts and rubrics have been added. I always feel profound respect for the learning and industry of the officials who draw up the *Ordo* for the different dioceses each year. Under their skilful guidance we are able to thread our way through the maze of doubles of all classes, semidoubles, simples, ferias, octaves, translations, commemorations, suffrages, and *preces*. Without their help we should be constantly going astray. One can see how all these complications have grown up; and if the Office were only some picturesque ruin—to be admired rather than used—one might find them an interesting subject for study. But it must occur to all of us to ask: Are all these complications necessary? Can nothing be done to make the Office simpler?

2. Again, it must be admitted that the Office, as at present recited, is monotonous. This may seem to be a contradiction to what has just been said. But complication does not exclude monotony. We may have the same, or nearly the same, sets of antiphons, psalms, lessons, and hymns day after day, and yet in addition to these we may have to hunt about for ninth lessons and commemorations and suffrages, and *Vesp. a Cap. Seq.* Certain psalms, from their appropriateness at morning or evening prayer, are rightly recited every day; e. g., *Deus Deus meus*, at Lauds, and the four psalms at Compline. But there are others with no such claim (e. g., *Beatus*

vir qui non abiit) which are said over and over again. Besides the weariness which arises from constant repetition, there is the further drawback that this involves the exclusion of other psalms either partially or altogether. We seldom recite any of the psalms appointed for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Nay more, in England four psalms (*Ecce quam bonum, Laudate nomen Domini, Cantate Domino . . . quoniam in aeternum, Super flumina Babylonis*) are not recited at all for years together! What has been said of the psalms is equally true of antiphons, hymns, and lessons. The ferial hymns at Matins, Lauds, and Vespers, are among the finest in the whole Breviary, and yet they are practically unknown to us.

3. I must be careful how I speak of the next objection to the Office—its length. Some of my readers will at once bring up the words of Mabillon quoted at the head of this article: "Quarum obligatio si nonnullis durior videtur et morosior, timendum est, ne id ex divinarum rerum taedio et fastidio oriatur." "Canst thou not watch one hour with Me?" our Lord seems to say to us reproachfully. One hour out of the twenty-four would surely be little enough to devote to His service. But the difficulty about the length of the Office does not come from those who grudge Him one hour; it comes rather from those whose days are spent in the active ministry. Their complaint is that just on the days when they have most to do, the Office is at its longest. The Sunday Office contains no less than thirty-seven Psalms, together with the one hundred and seventy-six verses of Ps. 118, besides the *Te Deum, Benedictus, Quicunque, Magnificat,* and *Nunc dimittis!* And this on a day in which they have to duplicate, singing the second Mass late and preaching at it, with an afternoon Catechism and Benediction, and a long evening service with another sermon. I know very well that under these circumstances a priest is not obliged to say the long Office; he may be excused altogether, or else he may fall back on the Rosary as a commutation. But this is not what he wants; he would like to say some Office, as he is accustomed

to look upon it as part of his daily devotions and part of the Liturgy of the day. It is not a bad plan to omit the eighteen Psalms at Matins and go on with the rest of the Office. This, however, involves the loss of some of the most devotional and interesting part of the Office, and so is open to the objection mentioned in the last paragraph. On a Saturday he is allowed to say a Votive Office instead of the Ferial one. But here again, he is saying what has no reference to the season, and he falls into the same old repetitions.

4. The fourth defect in the Office is the uncritical character of some of the lessons and antiphons and other parts. Some of those who recite it feel this very keenly; they strongly object to utter what they know to be false. On the other hand, I dare say there are many who do not feel this difficulty at all. But it has been recognized by the highest authority, and a Commission is now sitting in Rome for the purpose of making the corrections necessitated by the present state of our historical knowledge. Instances could easily be multiplied. At the end of Dom Bäumer's second volume [1] will be found a long list of pseudo-legends in the Offices of the ancient Popes, and of sermons and homilies falsely attributed to the Fathers. The Offices during the Octave of Corpus Christi are singularly unfortunate in this latter respect, and so may easily lead astray the priest who uses them in his discourses on the Blessed Sacrament. Even some feasts are based upon legends which are no longer tenable. For example, much as we may regret it, the beautiful legend of "Our Lady of Snows" cannot stand in the light of modern criticism.

5. One other defect remains to be mentioned. While the Office is a sign of the universality of the Church, local devotion has always had a place in it. Some enthusiasts have indeed wished that the same Office should be said everywhere, at least in the western Church, on the same day. But such uniformity has rightly been deemed excessive. The great seasons of the year and the festivals of Saints who have ex-

[1] *Histoire du Bréviaire.*

ercised influence over the Church at large must of course be celebrated everywhere. It is contended, however, by some that certain Saints and certain devotions which are merely of local interest have been extended to the Church universal. As I have no desire to give offence, I abstain from giving a number of instances of these. There is no doubt that many of them have been gladly welcomed for the sake of avoiding the long ferial Office.

Such, then, are some of the defects of the Office in its present state: it is complicated, monotonous, too lengthy, uncritical in parts, and often merely of local interest.

II.

Those who object to the reform of the Office or despair of the possibility of reform, should be reminded that the Office has actually been reformed more than once in modern times. At the time of the great reform carried out by St. Pius V, that Pontiff decreed that his edition of the Breviary should never be changed wholly or in part; that nothing whatever should be added to it or taken away.[2] His immediate successor, however, Gregory XIII, added the Office of the Rosary and restored that of St. Anne which Pius had suppressed. Other Pontiffs in like manner have felt themselves free to deal with the Office as they thought fit. The revision of the Vulgate (1592) necessitated vast changes in the Breviary. The Calendar and the Lessons also underwent many reforms at the hands of Baronius during the pontificate of Clement VIII. Still more drastic were the changes made by Urban VIII. These referred especially to the text of the lessons from the Fathers, and above all to the prosody of the hymns. Urban was himself a writer of Latin verse entirely in the style of the Renaissance. He could see no merit in the rhythmical poetry of the Patristic and Scholastic ages, just as his taste in architecture prevented him from appreciating the beauty of

[2] "Statuentes Breviarium ipsum nullo unquam tempore vel totum, vel ex parte mutandum, vel ei aliquid addendum, vel omnino detrahendum esse."

the ancient basilicas. Hence, he dealt as ruthlessly with the one as with the others. Those who deplore the pseudo-classical "restorations" which he made in the churches will understand the regrets of liturgical scholars over the havoc which he wrought in the old hymns. "Quod non fecerunt barbari fecerunt Barberini." No great change has been made since Urban's time, though successive Pontiffs have not hesitated to add fresh Offices and to promote certain feasts to a higher rank in the Calendar. A change of some importance was made, however, by Leo XIII in quite recent times: feasts of the rank of doubles or lower rank (with some exceptions) were no longer to be translated. This rule, it may be said with all deference, has not been altogether a welcome one.

Besides these changes which have been made, a great project of reform was undertaken by Benedict XIV.[3] The chief aim of the reform was the restoration of the Office *De Tempore* which had been almost entirely ousted by the Office of Saints. This was to be brought about by the suppression of a goodly number of feasts, including most of those of Our Lady. The proposed Calendar is given at the end of Dom Baudot's book. It shows that though the principle was sound, the application of it was carried out too much in the spirit of that "Philosophic" age. This, no doubt, was the reason why it was not accepted by Benedict, though that Pontiff's passion for doing everything himself and not depending on the labors of others may have had something to do with the failure of the project. The documents of the Commission of reform still exist, and may yet be of service when a fresh attempt is made.

Any scheme of reform of the Breviary will stand no chance of success unless it proceeds on conservative lines. It must retain the features of the Office as it has come down to us

[3] An account of it is given in Mgr. Batiffol's *Histoire du Bréviaire Romain*, ch. vi. See also Dom Bäumer, *op. cit.*, II, ch. xii; Dom Baudot, *Le Bréviaire Romain*, pp. 145-154.

through the long course of ages. A deal of lopping and pruning may be admitted, but the result must be that the new form must be substantially the same as the old. The seven hours must be retained ("Septies in die laudem dixi Tibi") in the same order and with same names as before, and with lessons and antiphons and hymns. Changes required by the critical and historical knowledge of our day are already in course of preparation. Any further changes will refer mainly to the Calendar and the distribution of the Psalter. It is chiefly in this way that the Office may be rendered simpler, and shorter, and more varied.

1. We have seen how the reform projected by Benedict XIV began with the consideration of the Calendar. If the Offices of the great seasons are to be restored, it must be by an extensive suppression of feasts. There will always be wide difference of opinion as to which feasts have to go. The following rules were adopted by Benedict XIV's Commission, and might well be applied at the present time:

(*a*) All the Saints who are mentioned in the Canon of the Mass should be retained;

(*b*) all whose feasts are mentioned in the ancient Roman Sacramentaries;

(*c*) all those Saints of whom authentic Acts have been preserved, and on whose feasts we have special homilies of the Fathers, provided that devotion (*cultus*) to them has survived;

(*d*) the Pope Saints who had an ancient *cultus;*

(*e*) the Doctors of the Church;

(*f*) the canonized Founders of Religious Orders;

(*g*) some Saint representative of each of the great Christian nations.

All the Saints not belonging to one of the above categories should be omitted from the general Calendar, unless they are held in exceptional honor throughout the universal Church.

If the omission of many of the Saints becomes a necessity, so too will be the omission of a number of feasts of Our Lady. Benedict's Commission omitted the Presentation, Name of

Mary, the Rosary, Our Lady of Ransom (Mercy), Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Seven Dolors, Espousals, Holy House of Loreto, Expectation. Yet since that time there have been added to the Calendar universally or locally: Help of Christians, Heart of Mary, Good Counsel, Consolation, Patronage, Perpetual Succor, Mother of the Good Shepherd, Our Lady of Lourdes, Miraculous Medal, Maternity, Mother of Grace, Purity, Humility, Visitation. It would be a matter of peculiar delicacy to single out which of these feasts must be sacrificed; yet it is clear that most of them will have to be restricted to some particular place or religious body.

Another means of restoring the Office *De Tempore* would be the abolition of all Octaves except those attached to the greatest feasts. A means of securing that at least the Scripture lessons of the season should be read, would be the reduction of all but a few feasts to the rank of doubles.

I dare say some of those who have read thus far will object that a Calendar of the kind suggested would indeed restore the Office *De Tempore*, but that this restoration is by no means to be desired. They look upon days on which no Saint's feast is celebrated as a "blank" day, commemorating nothing and nobody. Surely this is a wrong notion. The holy seasons of Advent, Lent, and Easter are ordained for the commemoration of the greatest mysteries of our religion. No Saints' offices should be allowed to take the place of these. Yet we find that over and over again the office which would remind us of the season is supplanted by the office perhaps of some Saint whose life is not of any general interest. I am writing this article during Paschal Time. The offices of the second, third, fourth, and fifth Sundays after Easter have been turned out for the offices of Saints. So, too, on five days of the Octave of the Ascension the season's offices have to make way for the offices of Saints. If the complete omission of these Saints from the Calendar would be too drastic a measure, they might have their lives read as a ninth lesson, with commemorations at Lauds and Vespers. But here we should be making the office longer—in direct contradiction to the very

object of reform. This is indeed one of the results of the partial reform introduced by Leo XIII. Hence it is clear that the mere reform of the Calendar does not go far enough—the office itself must be reformed. Busy priests, however much they may desire to say the offices of the season, will not do so if these are notably longer than the offices of the Saints.

2. We have seen that any reform of the Office should be made on conservative lines—that is to say, the existing structure of the Office must be retained. This, however, would not exclude a redistribution of the Psalter. The large number of Psalms contained in the Sunday and ferial offices makes many a priest welcome the occurrence of a feast or induces him to take refuge in the Votive offices. The present distribution of the Psalms, though of great antiquity, is not of the essence of the office. It bears marks of having been intended for a state of things very different from that in which we now live. In olden days the offices for Saturday and Sunday—the Vigil and the Lord's Day—were rightly the longest of all the offices. On these days it was fitting that a longer time should be spent in prayer. And even at the present time those priests and religious who are not engaged in the ministry are rightly expected to devote much of the Saturday and Sunday to the duties of choir. But the vast majority of the clergy find it almost impossible to get through these extra long offices. What is to be done? Some have suggested the omission of Matins or the Little Hours, or permission to recite a Votive office of the Blessed Trinity on Sundays. But these suggestions are only ways of shirking the difficulty. The best plan, undoubtedly, would be an arrangement whereby the offices of these days should be at least no longer than the offices of the other days of the week.

It should be realized at once that any redistribution of the Psalter must be thorough in order to remedy the existing inequalities. A mere modification of the existing arrangement would only cause greater confusion. I make this remark for the benefit of those who may consider the following sugges-

tions extreme. Our guiding principles should be: (1) the recital of the entire Psalter every week; (2) the recital of the same number of Psalms each day; (3) the avoidance of repetition, except where repetition is advisable.

Beginning with the last of these principles it will be admitted that Matins should always begin with the *Venite*, and that Ps. 62 (*Deus Deus meus*), Ps. 148 (*Laudate Dominum de coelis*), Ps. 149 (*Cantate Domino*), and Ps. 150 (*Laudate Dominum in sanctis*), are admirably suited to Lauds. In like manner the four Compline Psalms (4, 30, 90, 133) express appropriate night thoughts. These, with Ps. 66 (*Deus misereatur*) might, therefore, be recited every day without change.[4] Psalm 118 (*Beati immaculati*) is of such great length that the recital of it may be distributed through the week at Prime. As it consists of twenty-two divisions, three of these might be recited each day with four on Sunday. So far, then, Lauds would contain every day the same five Psalms with a varying canticle (as now); Prime, three (or four) different portions of Ps. 118; Compline, the same four Psalms every day.

We have now one hundred and forty Psalms to be divided among the seven days; that is, twenty for each day. They might be distributed in the following way:

MATINS	9
TIERCE	2
SEXT	2
NONE	2
VESPERS	5
Total	20

The chief novelty, it will be noted, would be in the three Little Hours, which would contain only two Psalms each, and these would be different each day. Something of the same sort is observed in the existing Sunday and ferial office

[4] Only the first portion of Ps. 30 is recited at Compline. The whole of it must be assigned to one day in the week.

at Prime. The distribution throughout the week would be as follows:

MATINS.

Sun.	*Mon.*	*Tu.*	*Wed.*	*Th.*	*Frid.*	*Sat.*
1	11	20	29	38	47	56
2	12	21	30	39	48	57
3	13	22	31	40	49	58
5	14	23	32	41	50	59
6	15	24	33	42	51	60
7	16	25	34	43	52	61
8	17	26	35	44	53	62
9	18	27	36	45	54	64
10	19	28	37	46	55	65
			TIERCE.			
67	73	79	85	92	99	105
68	74	80	86	93	100	106
			SEXT.			
69	75	81	87	95	101	107
70	76	82	88	96	102	108
			NONE.			
71	77	83	89	97	103	117
72	78	84	91	98	104	142

The order of the Psalms at Vespers would be exactly the same as in the existing Breviary.

If this scheme were adopted, the Sunday office would consist of the *Venite* and nine other Psalms at Matins; five Psalms with the *Benedicite* at Lauds; four divisions of Psalm 118 at Prime (with the *Quicunque?*); two psalms each at Tierce, Sext, and None; five psalms at Vespers; four psalms at Compline:—in all, counting the portion of Ps. 30 as a whole psalm, thirty psalms and four divisions of Ps. 118. If this be compared with the present Sunday office of thirty-seven psalms and the whole of the twenty-two divisions of Ps. 118, the amount of relief will be evident.

Take again the office of the day on which I am writing: Wednesday, 15 May, the feast of St. John Baptist de la Salle. Although the feast has been only recently instituted, it would be retained in a reformed calendar as the feast of the

Founder of a Religious Order. The antiphons, hymns, little chapters, etc., would be a Confessor not a Bishop. The psalms at Matins would be *Venite* and 29-37; at Lauds 62 (with 66), Anna's Canticle (*Exultavit*), Ps. 148, 149, 150 (these three as separate Psalms); at Prime 118 (three divisions, *Defecit, In aeternum, Quomodo*); at Tierce 85, 86; at Sext 87, 88; at None 89, 91; at Vespers 126, 130; at Compline 4, 30, 90, 133. Some might object that these psalms have nothing to do with a Confessor not a Bishop, but it will be found that many passages are most appropriate. The verse *Venite filii, audite me, timorem Domini docebo vos* (Ps. 33: 12) better describes the life-work of the Saint than any words in the existing office. On great feasts, of course, special psalms might be arranged.

So much for the Calendar and the distribution of the Psalter. Many minor changes might be suggested which could be made without any great difficulty; for example, the abolition of the *Suffragia* and *Preces*, except when the office is said in choir. But enough has already been said for the present.

T. B. SCANNELL.

Weybridge, England.

PIUS X. AND THE ITALIAN SEMINARIES.

SEMINARIES are the nurseries of the life of the Church. They are, of course, not the only places where that life is nurtured; in the novitiates of religious orders it is given in a higher form to those who are called to follow the evangelical counsels. Still there is a great difference between seminaries and novitiates. These latter instil and foster a spirit of rule according to specific purposes; but the former touch the immediate life-springs of the priesthood of the Church. Hence the peculiar solicitude of popes and bishops about the proper training and education of aspirants to the priesthood. The Council of Trent found it necessary to provide special schools, called Seminaries, for that purpose, since conditions were no longer favorable to the spiritual and intellectual train-

ing of the clergy. The Church has, and claims, full right to superintend such schools. Principally because that superintendence was curtailed or assumed by state authorities did the Fathers of Trent draw up their famous decree on seminaries.

Yet the seminaries, like the Church, must meet the exigencies of time and place in which they flourish. Indeed, the Church will adapt herself precisely as her clergy have been taught and trained to do in the seminary. Humanly speaking, the Church is no wiser than her clergy. The Holy Spirit, it is true, acts on the Church, but His instruments must be prepared before hands can be laid on. In addition, while the seminaries are the nurseries of Church life, hence specific in character, they must nevertheless endow their pupils with culture and learning. Church discipline and doctrine are not their only purpose; for a priest is not simply to be drilled in ceremonies and engaged to dispense doctrine and command by rote. His accomplishment must be more extensive. Since seminaries are to furnish the priest with all he needs for the effective exercise of his office, their courses must comprise classics of pagan times, researches of modern times, and much more than the three R's—in short, they must give a liberal education.

Some years ago a dispute was carried on in Germany between seminary and university representatives about the relative value of seminary and university studies. The discussion was warm. The condition of the clergy in Latin countries was ascribed, often unduly, to their seminary training. The only hope, it was assumed, lay in training at promiscuous schools, while in seminaries the final preparation for the priesthood should be given. That of course would leave seminaries only the work of cutting, pruning, and training in spiritual exercises. The provision of the Council of Trent in the matter would be obsolete. Those contending for the seminary, however, rightly insisted that the mind of the Church has not changed, that the reasons which induced the Fathers of Trent to establish seminaries are even stronger now. Seminaries themselves should be reformed wherever necessary.

Bishops, who are guardians and superiors, should make the necessary reforms; but seminaries should not be abolished or reduced to drill-schools in spirituality.

That the mind of the Church has not altered in this respect appears from the special measures lately taken by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for the Reformation of Seminaries in Italy. Those measures were approved and firmly recommended by Pius X on 5 May of the present year. There is to be no delay in their application; they go into effect at the Fall opening of the seminaries in Italy.

It is interesting to study the Program of Reform; for, although it concerns seminaries in Italy, it discloses the mind of the Church on the education of candidates to the priesthood. It tells, too, how alert the Holy Father is to the pressing want of an adequate training of the clergy. What he is doing for Italy can be done by the bishops elsewhere wherever reform is needed in the Church.

The Secretary of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars sent a letter to all the bishops in Italy, informing them that the Holy Father himself charged that body "to reorganize the seminaries of Italy." The Congregation therefore presents a program of studies for Gymnasium, Lyceum, and Theology courses. The courses of the first two are arranged in accordance with those followed in state schools in Italy, for two reasons: first, because the clergy, if not educated by those standards, would be considered inferior to laymen who are educated in those schools. Those courses, besides, are considered to give such a degree of culture as is required in modern times. Secondly, because "our students cannot, as a rule, decide whether they have a vocation to the ecclesiastical state until they have reached a certain age. If any, therefore, should change their mind, their clerical education would not be an obstacle to the choice of a professional career. They could secure diplomas required by law and thus be more free in their choice of a state of life."

"A wise and prudent superintendence," the letter adds, "will easily prevent or lessen the number of students who remain

in seminaries merely to get an education and secure the diplomas of the Lyceum, but who have no intention of becoming priests."

"The program of the Lyceum," as is emphasized in the letter, "adds nothing to the Philosophy Course in the seminaries, except the continuation of the study of Letters and History, a study most necessary for the students of the sanctuary in order that they may be *instructi ad omne opus bonum.*"

Here we may pause to reflect on the fundamental supposition of these measures of reform. The seminary, preparatory and theological, is still held apart from other schools, its prime, not to say sole, purpose being the education of those who feel called to the priesthood. The degree of culture in preparatory seminaries is to be equal to that in secular schools, while the special training in spiritual and disciplinary matters is to give the candidate such quality as he needs for the ministry; otherwise the program would prescribe attendance at state or public schools.

The decree of the Council of Trent is then still in force: "Cum adolescentium aetas nisi recte instituatur, prona sit ad mundi voluptates sequendas, et, nisi a teneris annis ad pietatem et religionem informetur, antequam vitiorum habitus totos homines possideat, numquam perfecte ac sine maximo ac singulari propemodum Dei omnipotentis auxilio in disciplina ecclesiastica perseveret."

The seminary is not a makeshift of Reformation times; neither is it only philosophical and theological; but preparatory, classic, collegiate, or whatever name this latter be given, as well as theological—in short, the seminary is to give a complete education for the priesthood.

Thus, it is clear the mind of the Church with respect to the function of the seminary is unchanged.

"In elaborating the Program, it has been decided to take as the basis of the order of studies the division of the courses which has already been introduced into nearly all the seminaries, namely, Gymnasium, Lyceum, and Theology." This

too is in keeping with the decree of Trent; for while it fixed the aim of seminaries, it did not fasten an unchangeable quantity of studies on them. "Docebunt autem praedicti [professores]," it states, "quae videbuntur episcopo expedire. De cetero vero officia vel dignitates illae, quae scholasticae dicuntur, non nisi doctoribus vel magistris aut licentiatis in sacra pagina aut in jure canonico, et aliis personis idoneis, et qui per se ipsos id munus explere possint, conferantur, et aliter facta provisio nulla sit et invalida." The decree concludes, "si opus fuerit, moderando aut augendo, omnia et singula, quae ad felicem hujus seminarii profectum necessaria et opportuna videbuntur, decernere ac providere valeat—episcopus."

In this instance it is the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars that provides for the seminaries of Italy. The reform of them is to make them equal, if not superior, to schools that furnish secular education only. Hence the Congregation arranged a division of class-matter as well as of class-hours. Rarely, if ever, has any Congregation of Rome drawn up such a detailed program of studies.

Throughout the program the main purpose of the seminary is continually emphasized. Thus, during the five-year course of the Gymnasium, Latin shall have the preference. During the three-year course of the Lyceum there shall be a year devoted to Propaedeutics, unless a dispensation be given, and "even then those parts of philosophy which are necessary for an adequate preparation for theological studies shall be specially taken." Thus from the first the aspirant to Holy Orders shall be led on by catechetical and apologetic instructions to theology. In the four-year course of Theology finally, Biblical studies shall receive greater attention. Sacred archeology and art and pastoral theology shall be treated—subjects somewhat new in Italian seminaries.

The prefect of studies, whom the bishop is to appoint, is vested with authority to arrange the bulletin; he is to act in union with the faculty. They are to meet in consultation every month. "Matters of greater importance for the scope

of seminaries are to be given more time." This implies that henceforth the progress and development of the seminary are not to suffer from personal or factional schemes.

There is to be no promotion to higher classes except by examinations. The duller student who failed shall have opportunity in supplementary tests. "No professor is to be burdened with too many hours of classes." Each teacher is to use a text-book, in the selection of which due consideration is to be given to the scope of seminary training. Text-books of philosophy and theology are to be chosen by a board of professors, then to be submitted to the bishop for final adoption.

The number of seminaries to be established, or the number to be reduced, is determined by the rule of the decree of Trent: "Si vero in aliqua provincia ecclesiae tanta paupertate laborent, ut collegium in aliquibus erigi non possit, synodus provincialis vel metropolitanus cum duobus antiquioribus suffraganeis—unum aut plura collegia, prout opportunum judicabit, erigenda curabit." In a note to the General Regulations of the program attention is called to the provision that "in the central and interdiocesan seminaries the rights of the Ordinary belong to the body of bishops interested." Hence the question whether every diocese must have its seminary is settled, and the fear of too many seminaries, which would be detrimental, can be removed by a body of bishops who concentrate their interest. The bishop or bishops then are nowhere so supreme as in their seminaries. The seminary is like the apple of their eye.

Such reformation of seminaries in Italy certainly meets a great want. Like all reforms, this one too will be slow and results not suddenly forthcoming. But that the Holy Father is serious about it is shown by his reduction of the dozen theological seminaries in Calabria to two. The reform should be hailed with joy by all who are interested in the paramount importance of seminaries in our times. It removes many doubts that arose with well-meaning persons about the decree of the Council of Trent. It will give new impulse to the idea of seminaries in other countries. Inspection of seminary lar-

ders, tables, physical equipments, etc., are to give room to the prime purpose of seminaries. The reader of the program of reform may be surprised by the absence of any mention of spiritualities; but he need not take alarm: the spiritual training *patet per se.*

In conclusion then: seminaries thus organized will furnish priests equipped for our times; self-sacrificing, they will bring back the nations to Christ. That is our Holy Father's watchword: *Restaurare omnia in Christo.* We are reassured that the seminaries are the nurseries of Church life among the Teutonic, Anglo-Saxon, and Mongolian races, as well as among the Latin races.

When the soreness of the Church is in her seminaries, the body of her faithful will go limping; when her health and strength are in them, no schism, nor heresy, nor moral decay will for long lodge in her members. This is not assigning supremacy and primacy in the Church to the seminary, but attributing to it such influence as will make for right guidance of the people by the clergy.

JOS. SELINGER.

Jefferson City, Mo.

A UNIFORM COURSE OF STUDIES FOR THE SEMINARIES OF ITALY.

CARDINAL Ferrata, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, having been charged with the promulgation of the new course of studies for seminaries in Italy (the original text of which course will be found in the *Analecta* department), addresses the Ordinaries of tne Italian dioceses in the following letter. It is accompanied by a syllabus indicating the program of studies to be introduced with the new scholastic term. In his letter the Cardinal sets forth that:

The Congregation of Bishops and Regulars commissioned by the Holy Father to reorganize the Seminaries of Italy has

deemed it advisable to submit a common Program of Studies whereby to unify and improve the instruction imparted in our Seminaries.

In outlining the order of studies it has been decided to take as a basis the division of the courses which has been already introduced into nearly all the seminaries, namely, Gymnasium, Lyceum, and Theologicum.

For the subjects which make up the courses in the Gymnasium and Lyceum, and for their distribution, it was necessary to adopt, with some necessary modifications, the programs in general use in Italy, not because these are perfect, but principally for the following reasons:

1. The programs in use represent in public estimation that culture which is required to-day; hence the efficiency of the clergy who have been educated according to them will be increased, whilst a lack of these demands will create, at least in the eyes of many, the impression that priests are inferior to laymen as regards true culture.

2. It is also to be considered that candidates, as a rule, cannot definitely decide upon their having a vocation to the ecclesiastical state before they have reached a certain age; hence it is advisable to regulate their studies in such a way that they may obtain recognized certificates of fitness, which will be useful to them in case they should adopt some other state of life. It is needless to say that such certificates are also likely to prove of advantage to those whom God may be pleased to call to the priesthood.

A wise and judicious superintendence will easily prevent, or will at the least greatly lessen, the abuses arising from the fact that students may remain in the seminaries after the Gymnasium course, for the mere purpose of obtaining the licentiate of the Lyceum course.

Moreover, the program of studies in the Lyceum accords with that which should form part of the Philosophy course in the seminaries, with the addition only of the department of Letters and History, quite necessary for students of the sanctuary who should be *instructi ad omne opus bonum.*

It has also been deemed advisable to prefix to the Theology course a year of Propedeutics, so as to complete the course of Philosophy, and to treat of certain subjects which cannot easily be included in the course of Theology. This additional year may

be dispensed with, if it can be shown that during the Lyceum course adequate preparation has been given for that of Theology.

Rules for the theological course are given so as to render it complete and easily compassed within four years.

Finally, a time-table is added, to serve as a guide to Prefects of Studies.

By the authority of the Holy Father, I have the honor to communicate this program to you with the request that you see it put in force in your seminary for the course of the next scholastic year.

You are also requested to report to this Sacred Congregation the rules governing the studies in your seminary and to forward the list of professors and of text-books used by them.

I trust that, under the assiduous care of Your Lordship, the exact observance of the program will be ensured whereby you will contribute efficaciously to the higher education of the clergy and enable them, with greater advantage to souls, to fulfil their noble mission.

D. Card. FERRATA, *Prefect.*
F. GIUSTINI, *Secretary.*

THE COURSE OF STUDIES.

The course of studies in all the Seminaries of Italy is divided into the departments of the Gymnasium, Lyceum, and Theologicum.

I. GYMNASIUM.

1. No student shall be admitted to the classes of the Gymnasium unless he present a certificate of fitness, showing that he has regularly completed the preceding classes, and pass the entrance examination.

2. The course of the Gymnasium shall be one of five years, divided into five classes, during which shall be taught the matters of the programs in general use, and the same time-table shall be followed, but in such a way as to give a certain preference to Latin in all the classes while at the same time qualifying the students to pass the examination of the Gymnasial licentiate.

3. At least one hour a week shall be assigned in every class for catechetical instruction.

II. LYCEUM.

1. No student shall be admitted to the Lyceum unless he have

regularly gone through the classes of the Gymnasium and passed the examinations.

2. The Lyceum shall be divided into three classes, corresponding with the three years of the course, and these classes shall correspond both with regard to the subjects and to the time-tables with the programs in general use, in such a way that the students shall be prepared to pass the Lyceal licentiate and at the same time a more ample development be given to sound philosophy. (See IV, 2 and 3.)

3. At least one hour a week shall be assigned for religious instruction.

III. PROPEDEUTICS.

1. In this course the students, besides acquiring a more profound knowledge of philosophy, shall study other matters, which may be those indicated in the time-table appended.

2. In the Seminaries where this year of Propedeutics shall be established the study of philosophy in the three years of the Lyceum shall embrace psychology, logic, general metaphysics, ethics.

3. Where a dispensation for this year has been obtained, clerics aspiring to the priesthood shall during the three years of the Lyceum, in addition to the matters contained in the program, have assigned to them at least two hours a week, if necessary even on Thursdays, for the completion of the study of philosophy, and especially of those parts of philosophy which are necessary for an adequate preparation for theological studies.

IV. THEOLOGY.

1. The course of Theology shall be one of four years, divided into four classes, with a regular time table of four hours a day of teaching.

2. It shall embrace the following matters: Loci theologici, General and Particular Introduction to the Sacred Scripture, Biblical Exegesis, Dogmatic Theology and the Sacraments, Moral and Pastoral Theology, Institutions of Canon Law, Ecclesiastical History, Hebrew, Greek, Sacred Archeology and Art, Sacred Eloquence and Patrology, Liturgy.

V. GENERAL REGULATIONS.

1. In order that this program may be properly carried out every Seminary shall have a Prefect of Studies, who is to be elected by the Bishop.

2. To the Prefect, always under the superintendence of the Bishop, shall appertain the preparation of the course of lectures for the Professors, the compilation of the Calendar and of the scholastic time-tables.

3. After having consulted with the Professors, whom he is to assemble in council every month, and more frequently should he judge it necessary, the Prefect of Studies shall apply, or even modify, the program in general use, arrange the hours of teaching according to these programs in such a way as to observe the substance of them and leave them adequate for the examinations of the licentiate, while at the same time allowing more time for matters of greater importance for the scope of the Seminaries, as has been above observed for Latin in the Gymnasium and Philosophy in the Lyceum.

4. The scholastic year shall last for not less than nine months.

5. The Prefect of Studies with the Board of Professors shall arrange that at the end of the year searching examinations be held regularly in all the matters, for promotion to the higher classes, and decide on the number of votes required for a pass.

6. A session for supplementary examinations shall be established for those who have failed to pass in the first examination.

7. The different matters in the Lyceal and Theological courses shall be entrusted to good Professors, who may also, by way of exception, be charged with teaching some branch kindred to their own. But in all cases care must be taken that no Professor be burdened with too many hours of teaching, to the evident loss of the students.

8. Each Professor in treating his subject shall employ a text-book, which he shall explain in such a way as to complete the annual course marked out in the Program.

9. For the Gymnasium and the Lyceum, as the programs in general use are to be followed, the text-books shall be selected in conformity with these programs, due regard of course being paid to the nature and scope of the Seminaries.

10. For Philosophy and Theology the text-book shall be pro-

posed by the Board of Professors, and submitted for the approval of the Bishop.

NOTE.—In the central and interdiocesan seminaries the rights of the Ordinary belong to the body of Bishops interested.

Seen and approved, with the earnest recommendation that Our Venerable Brothers the Bishops faithfully observe the above.

Feast of St. Pius V.

5 May, 1907. PIUS X POPE.

APPENDIX.

TIME-TABLE FOR THE CLASS OF PROPEDEUTICS.

First hour.—Every day: "De vera religione."

Second hour.—Monday, Wednesday and Friday: "Propedeutics to Ecclesiastical History;" Tuesday and Saturday: "Biblical Greek."

Third hour.—Monday, Wednesday and Friday: "Theodicea;" Tuesday and Saturday: "Natural Law."

Fourth hour.—Monday, Wednesday and Friday: "Cosmology;" Tuesday and Saturday: "History of Philosophy."

TIME-TABLE FOR THEOLOGY.

Monday, first hour.—First year: "Loci Theologici;" second, third and fourth year: "Moral Theology."

Second hour.—Second, third and fourth year: "Dogma;" first year: "Moral, De actibus humanis, Conscientia, Legibus."

Third hour.—First and second year: "Hebrew or Greek, Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures;" third and fourth year: "Institutions of Canon Law."

Fourth hour, for all years: "Hebrew or Greek, Introduction to Ecclesiastical History."

Tuesday, first hour.—First and second year: "The Sacred Scriptures;" third and fourth year: "Institutions of Canon Law."

Second hour, all four years: "Biblical Exegesis."

Third hour, all four years: "Sacred Archeology and Art."

Fourth hour, all four years: "Ecclesiastical History."

Wednesday, first, second and third hour as on Monday.

Fourth hour, all four years: "Biblical Exegesis."

Friday, as on Monday.
Saturday, first and second hour, as on Monday.
Third hour, all four years: "Sacred Eloquence, Patrology."
Fourth hour, all four years: "Sacred Liturgy."

With the foregoing time-table the plan of lectures works out as follows:

For the first year: Four hours of "Hebrew or Greek, and Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures;" two hours of "Biblical Exegesis;" four hours of "Loci Theologici;" four hours of "Fundamental Treatises of Moral Theology;" three hours of "Ecclesiastical History;" one hour of "Sacred Archeology and Art;" one hour of "Sacred Eloquence and Patrology;" one hour of "Sacred Liturgy." Total, twenty hours.

For the second year: Four hours of "Hebrew or Greek and Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures;" four hours of "Moral;" two hours of "Biblical Exegesis;" four hours of "Dogma;" three hours of "Ecclesiastical History;" one hour of "Sacred Archeology and Art;" one hour of "Sacred Eloquence and Patrology;" one hour of "Sacred Liturgy." Total, twenty hours.

For the third and fourth years: Four hours of "Moral and Pastoral Theology;" four hours of "Institutions of Canon Law;" three hours of "Ecclesiastical History;" two hours of "Biblical Exegesis;" one hour of "Sacred Archeology and Art;" one hour of "Sacred Eloquence and Patrology;" one hour of "Sacred Liturgy." Total, twenty hours.

A CLERICAL STORY OF "SIXES AND SEVENS."

XII.

THE three days we spent at Lakeby will remain long in memory. The usual accompaniments of a stay at such a place, such as boating, bathing, riding, and walking, proved with us to be merely avocations from the one controlling business of discussion. Indeed, they can hardly be called avocations, for the discussion flowed on with scarcely an interruption, whether we walked or drove or boated or bathed. The only safe refuge was the bed, and the only secure hour was that of retiring to rest; for Lakeby was a health resort,

and Father Boyton was a firm believer in early to bed and early to rise.

The mysterious hints concerning a coming visitor, with which Boyton had stimulated our curiosity, found their answer the next evening in the arrival of no less important a personage than the Bishop himself. We were all of us his diocesans save Father Julius, whose diocese was, as already mentioned in these pages, Farburg and not Ironton. Father Boyton presented Julius, in his usual extravagant style, as a great *authority*—meanwhile casting at Dr. Magnus a mischievous glance—in Church music. "He has already confounded all the enemies of the Chant, Bishop," he added, "and notably that renowned apologist of the existing order, or *dis*order, our own Dr. Magnus, if you please."

"Why, Boyton, where are you leaving yourself as a champion of the existing order in Church music?" the Bishop asked with a roguish smile. The two were old chums, even classmates in the seminary, and Father Boyton was privileged to say things beyond the daring of any one else, while the Bishop, on his side, administered many a sly dig that he would spare any one but his old classmate. "Your reputation, Boyton, is fairly well established as an unsparing critic of the proposed reforms."

"It's all different now, Bishop."

"Why, have you seen a great light, like St. Paul?"

"I can't help it, if I am like St. Paul," laughed Boyton; "but the fact is I have seen a great light."

"And how was it that you could so enthusiastically defend the old order in music?"

"I can only say what Dr. Johnson said to the lady who asked him how he *could* define 'pastern' as 'the knee of a horse'?"

"And what did the learned Doctor say?" inquired Magnus, who did not pretend to Johnsonese lore.

"Being an honest man, Magnus, even more than a dialectician, what could he say but 'Ignorance, madam, pure ignorance'?"

"The Diocesan Commission is all here, barring the Vicar General," remarked Father James, "and perhaps he will object to a discussion in which he has no part."

"It is not a formal meeting," laughed the Bishop, "and we shall not record our activity in written minutes."

"I am glad of that, anyhow," said Boyton; "for possibly the minutes would take the form of recommendations; and if that unfortunately happened, it would be the death of any reform-movement in music."

"What makes you think that?" inquired Father James.

"I mean," said Boyton, "that recommendations, or even commands, that have any air of perfunctoriness about them, are worse than useless. I suppose it would be charitable so to interpret the language of the last two Plenary Councils of Baltimore in the matter of Church music, in the light of the subsequent ignoring of the conciliar commands, exhortations, recommendations, or whatever you may style the official language employed."

"Save us from the rigor of the recently-converted reformer," said Father James. "You know, Boyton, that you yourself have not lived up to the conciliar commands. 'Monemus rectores ecclesiarum ut sedulo invigilent ad abusus eliminandos qui in cantu ecclesiastico in his regionibus invaluerunt' —so declares the Second Plenary Council. It says much more to the point, and so does the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore; but do you not notice the wording, 'monemus *rectores* ecclesiarum'? It has always been most unequivocally your own business to correct any musical abuse in your own church."

Dr. Magnus, who seemed to enjoy this little tilt, interposed at this point to ask Father Boyton whether he had ever heard the reason why Jerusalem was such a clean city. "I am no canonist, like Father James," he added, "but—"

"But 'Davus sum, non Oedipus,' and I never was good at conundrums," growled Boyton, "so let us have the reason without further delay."

"Why, the reason is very plain — every one kept his own doorstep clean," retorted Magnus.

"The fact is," added Father James, "that precept nearly always outstrips performance; and legislation, even conciliar, often holds up an ideal which few may hope to attain, while all may labor toward its attainment in partial ways which, under certain circumstances, are the only ways practicable."

"The canonist again," commented Boyton. "The real danger is—as my own experience of non-conformity in the past illustrates — that nothing will be done if our Diocesan Commission considers its work finished when it has drawn up a series of ferociously loyal resolutions. Such a course is only beating the air; the resolutions must be carried out under appropriate sanctions, and a Diocesan Commission is the body provided by the *Motu proprio* for the one purpose of seeing that the legislation of the Holy Father really is carried out."

"A just observation, Boyton," said the Bishop. "A very real difficulty is, nevertheless, to find in every diocese the right kind of men to constitute such a Commission. It is surely a compliment, and no adverse reflection upon our own Commission, when I say that I have chosen the men best able to serve upon it; and yet these gentlemen know how little unanimity of view or of purpose exists in our diocese or even among the members of the Commission itself. It is the very effort which that Commission is making to avoid grandiose pronouncements urging impracticable measures of reform, that has delayed definite action and has called forth criticism from the laity. Here, for instance, is a letter from one indignant layman."

The Bishop took from his pocket a formidably bulky document, and as he unfolded its many pages, remarked:

"I shall not mention the writer's name, neither will I inflict all of this upon your attention, gentlemen; but just notice the belligerent tone of a portion of it:

> You may accuse me of overzealousness, but I can give all assurance that I but represent the point of view of many devout members of the laity when I say that, having read the Instruction of the Holy Father, we are shocked at the lack of obedience toward its regulations manifested by our clergy, whose policy seems to be one of delay and tergiversation, or of

pretended activity in the interests of a reform which they have no wish to effect and which they would be glad to postpone till the Greek calends. It is now three years since we, who have been complaining for so long a time, and so vainly, of the abuses in our Church musical services, hailed with liveliest satisfaction the long and beautiful Letter of the Holy Father on Sacred Music. We felt confident that it would issue in all the reforms so long advocated—but how little has been accomplished in all this time! What music do we still hear in the churches? It is the music everywhere condemned in that long document of the Pope; for

1. It hardly differs in spirit or treatment from its sister-music of the opera, and so transforms, as far as in it lies, the sacred edifice into a theatre.

2. It thus robs the church of its sacredness, making it vulgar and commonplace.

3. It robs the Holy Sacrifice of its impressiveness and unique character, placing it on the inevitable plane of comparison with the scenery and action of an opera; for the music in each case is the same in spirit—flashy, sensational, humanly emotional, pretentiously dramatic in methods and in the mannerisms of the singers. It is true, I know, that the Divine Tragedy of Calvary is reproduced, and in a symbolically dramatic manner, in the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar; but such is the divine sobriety of the priestly action there, so majestic is the quiet progress of the action toward its consummation, so uplifting are the prayers and chants of the priest—in a word, so non-worldly, so spiritual, delicate, refined, other-worldly, is this Sacred Drama of the Mass, that not for a single moment could the thought of a comparison with any worldly drama ever enter into the mind. But alas! the *music* actually accompanying this Divine Drama in our days almost forces a comparison with secular drama or opera.

4. It suffers terribly by comparison, even upon the low plane to which it compels the comparison to descend; for it is an extremely poor second to the similar but much better sung music of the opera-nights with their perfectly trained musicians in the orchestra, perfectly trained and highly-gifted voices on the stage, and perfect appropriateness of the music to the operatic libretto.

5. Compelling the comparison I have just referred to, it robs the congregation of their piety, through operatic *motifs* in the music and operatic mannerisms in the singers; and indeed some of the congregation may be seen looking back toward the choir-loft, while we may reasonably suspect that others, more reverent though they be in the holy place, still are revolving in their minds whether Miss So-and-So or Mrs. Thingummy is to sing the next "number"—the "Gratias agimus" perhaps, or the "Et incarnatus" perchance.

6. It robs the celebrant of his recollectedness; for, unless he look sharp, he will display his ignorance of musical masterpieces before the whole congregation by mounting the steps to the Holy Altar of God, under the delusion that the last thundering *Amen* by which he has been startled really *was* the end, whereas the singers must retrace their steps to "Et unam sanctam" and do the whole thing over again, to his hesitating and lamentable confusion.

7. It violates many laws of the liturgy, omits and transposes and repeats whole words and phrases and sentences of the sacred texts, in a way scarcely credible save to any one who patiently studies the musical texts and compares them with the liturgical texts.

8. It blows its own horn so loud and so long that one might fancy the sacred liturgy was meant only as a convenient opportunity for the display of the music; so that when the celebrant modestly intones the Preface or the Pater Noster, we become conscious of a ludicrous misfit somewhere in the service. He has stood so long and so patiently while the choir thundered and the organ blared, waiting for a chance to continue the Sacred Drama, that the incongruity becomes painfully apparent to any mind that reflects on the meaning of the Holy Mass and the relative importance of celebrant and of choir.

9. From being the handmaiden it has thus exalted itself into the lofty position of the mistress, not so much dividing the attention of the congregation as concentrating it solely upon herself.

10. Altogether, it is so truly "of the earth, earthly," that "it smells rank to heaven."

In what item is this indictment exaggerated? What item of it, rather, could not be illustrated by innumerable examples, if observant auditors were to pool their experiences?

"There is a sample, gentlemen, of the *indignant* correspondent. I have here with me another letter illustrating the *humorous* correspondent. Just a few lines from it—and I will draw a moral:

I have not the pleasure of an acquaintance with Your Lordship, but as an Anglican Catholic I am deeply interested in the music of the Roman Church, and have read several times the important announcement of Pius X concerning music. It has really pained me to observe that much of it has not been put into effect, so that, comparing the pronouncement with its result, one is tempted to consider it as a species of "Jabberwocky":

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
Did gyre and gimbal in the wabe.
All mimsy were the borrogoves
And the momeraths outgrabe.

"It sounds very beautiful," said little Alice in Lewis Carroll's classic, "but it is dreadful hard to understand." I have attended many functions in Your Lordship's diocese, and the music I have listened to recalled the poetry of Jabberwocky. It also recalled the astonishment of Alice when, after running very hard and very fast with the White Queen, she found herself in the same spot under the same tree from which she had started. The instructions of Pius X have been running very hard and very fast, but in this diocese, if Your Lordship will pardon me for saying it, they seem to have remained in the self-same spot all the time.

"What bumptious impertinence," cried Father James hotly.

The Bishop raised his hand with a gentle gesture of deprecation, and said mildly:

"*Fas est et ab hoste doceri*, and I have put aside any thought of the motive and the manner of this correspondent, in order to consider with all freedom of mind the real basis of his complaint. It is clear to me from both letters, which are only types of a rather large number I have received, that the laity do take—at least many of them—a real interest in Church services, and that the rubrical and liturgical aspects of the services speak to their intelligence and their piety. While the reforms are not easy of accomplishment, it is clear that we must put forth every effort to change whatever is amiss. And yet, how shall this be done? It is a work requiring the exercise of sound taste in Church music, and many prevalent ideals of Church music will have to be radically changed. This means *instruction*, and long-continued instruction; for tastes are not changed by legislation or by preaching. A new spirit must be engendered—but just how and just where is the difficulty."

"For the laity, the process must begin with the mother-houses of our teaching orders," said Father Boyton, with great positiveness of tone. "The teachers in our schools must have good taste in this matter, must cease teaching Salvation Army ditties to the children, and wishy-washy hymns and frothy airs. They must begin to study the old approved chants, and utterly revise their taste in music. 'The hand that rocks the cradle,' etc. And until we begin at this beginning, our measures will always be unintelligibly halting and ineffective. The Bishop has touched the sore spot—it is our *taste* that must be wholly changed."

"Where are you leaving the priests in this radical movement?" said Dr. Magnus.

"I think Father Julius could best answer that question," replied Boyton.

Father Julius being thus directly appealed to, remarked that, obviously, the seminary course in sacred music must be

broadened and deepened, in accordance with the thought of the Holy Father.

"If the subject of Church music reform be really a burning one," he said, "recognition of this fact should appear in the importance assigned to the teaching of music in our seminaries. But in that case, no student should be admitted to a seminary if he be unable to tell one sound from another, for of course such a student will no more understand instruction in the chant than would a blind man understand a lecture on colors."

"That would keep out of the sacred ministry many a zealous, studious, pious applicant, and would make a musical ear a *sine qua non* of a vocation to the priesthood," said Father James.

"I really do not think so," replied Father Julius. "An absolutely incorrigible ear, one wholly irresponsive to melody, is the rarest of the *lusus naturae*. The pity is that a boy who is preparing to enter the seminary is not examined in good time concerning this matter. He is shrewdly coached in the entrance requirements either by his pastor or by the college to which he is sent, and much is made of Latin and Greek, of history and geometry. Nothing at all is said about the fundamental necessity of being able, when he is a priest, to sing the Preface, the Pater Noster, the Gospel, with a decent recognition of their melody. And the reason for the ignoring of this fundamental necessity is, that no inquiry is made as to an applicant's musical ear, in the entrance examination; and the preparatory schools will therefore not waste a minute of their precious time on a matter like the possession of a musical ear, since this doesn't 'count' for entrance."

"But what difference does it make if a boy lacks the musical ear?" asked Father Boyton. "If he hasn't it, he hasn't it—and that's all there is to it."

"Of course, if he absolutely lacks the musical ear," replied Julius, "nothing, perhaps, is to be said or done. But what I wish to insist upon is, that this is an extremely rare lack, and that what so often *seems* to be such a lack can be removed by

the careful and persistent efforts of a competent voice-trainer. Indeed, in most cases not even so much as this is required in order to remove the apparently natural difficulty of a bad ear. Often a little earnest practice of the scales under the tutorship of a boy friend will work wonders. The difficulty of remedying this defect increases as time passes by. The young man of twenty years may prove a most difficult subject, where the lad of twelve would have yielded readily to treatment. And therefore I say that seminaries should have an entrance requirement—very moderate, indeed—in music; they should require every applicant to be able to distinguish one sound from another in respect of pitch."

"I perceive your idea," said Father Bernard. "Your contention that a remediable defect should be attended to when its significant presence (as in the case of a boy preparing to enter a seminary) is first noticed or noticeable, seems to me sound. A stitch in time saves nine; for, if the lack of a musical ear be not promptly remedied, it is apt to become inveterate and almost irremediable. It is unjust to a seminary to saddle it with the correction of such an idiosyncracy in a pupil; and as a matter of fact no seminary will ever undertake such a task, as this would require both that the pupil be excused from the regular order of tasks for many hours in the course, to the detriment of his studies, or that a singing-master should be employed, at great expense to the seminary, for the individual behoof of a few students. Seminaries do not employ oculists to remedy defects of vision, aurists to remedy those of hearing; but the student who should happen to labor under any such defects is forced, either to postpone his entrance into a seminary until such defects shall have first been remedied, or to pay for the services of an expert specialist out of his own pocket. And if, after sufficient treatment, the defect perdures and is such as to notably interfere with his proper performance of clerical duties, he is not ordained. But it is curious to notice how the same logic is persistently set aside in the case of poor musical ears. One of the most obvious necessities of the priestly life is the singing of High Mass; and in-

deed throughout all the solemn services of the liturgy the singing of the sacred ministers is a requirement that cannot be evaded. Seminaries know this, of course; but they continue to graduate students who cannot at all perform this elementary duty of their priestly life."

"I am happy to be in agreement with Father Julius on this point," said Dr. Magnus. "And it has always seemed to me a strange fact that we should be content to spend money like water on splendid buildings for our ceremonial, costly vestments, electric-light equipment, and the rest; and that in the matter of the essentials of the ceremonial we should meanwhile be so negligent and indifferent. It is not the costly battleship that wins a victory so much as the man behind the gun, trained to the most efficient use of the costly equipment placed under his control. The vestments may be a miracle of embroidery, the altar a miracle of marble-work, the sacred vessels a miracle of craftsmanship, and the chants of the Preface and Pater Noster a miracle—as we know them to be—of ethereally devotional and musical inspiration; but what purpose do all these accessories serve, if the sacred minister, the moment he ceases to be a mere lay-figure for displaying the costliness of the vestments, etc., begins to interpret, in the Song of the Bride of Christ, the symbolic meaning of all this apparatus, and utters that venerable Song in a most inefficient manner?"

"But it is not the fault of the sacred minister that nature should have refused him this one gift," cautioned Father James. "Everybody recognizes that even a most learned man and a saintly may be forced to take his turn in singing the Chant, although nature, which has so richly endowed him in other most necessary ecclesiastical lines, has denied to him this one gift of a musical ear."

"Surely I must not be understood to reflect upon my brethren in what I have said," replied Dr. Magnus with just a little heat. "I am merely stating a condition that I think should receive some consideration. Neither am I pleading the cause of a small economy in the decoration of the House of God

and the place where His glory dwelleth; but I am trying to indicate one essential in which that proper decorative spirit has not sufficiently exercised itself, and this the rather that it is an essential which money—mere money—cannot buy, but which a reverent attitude toward the mysteries of religion would, as Father Julius has pointed out, enable us to compass with just a little foresight and properly applied energy."

"I think I can illustrate Dr. Magnus's point of view with a concrete illustration," said Julius at this juncture. His mild, even tone and entire absence of controversial excitement served to allay the growing combativeness that threatened to become acute.

"I do not happen to know," he continued, "how such occasional functions as the dedication of a church or the laying of a corner-stone are usually performed in this diocese—I mean in respect of the chanting of the psalms, etc. But I do know that in Farburg diocese the clergy have been dissatisfied, for many years, at the haphazard way in which this is done, especially in view of the patent fact that just at those times, if never at any other, many non-Catholics are present, and must form their judgments on the ceremonial of the Church and the asserted beauty of the Chant from what they then see and hear. The clergy who assemble at any one of these functions are usually those of the immediate neighborhood; the event is somewhat infrequent, and the clergy will hardly be the same body on any two such occasions. The result is that the psalms, which are located in widely different places in the Breviary (the only book in the hands of the priests at the moment), have to be laboriously sought out, and one voice after another will join in the recitation of the psalms in a casual way as, one after another, the priests succeed in finding the proper psalm. Meanwhile, there is no common understanding as to the places where breath should be taken; and, if the psalms are sung, there is no common understanding of the syllable where the mediation or the final cadence should begin. The general effect of such chanting is, of course, poor in the extreme. It is a confused hubbub of

sounds, out of which will frequently arise the stentorian voice of some energetic priest who is striving to create, by *force majeure*, some unity in the singing. Altogether, this very important matter results in a 'go-as-you-please' race.

"Now, it occurred to a certain thoughtful priest, who had begun organizing a parish in a district comprising a cultivated population most of which was Protestant but quite friendly to his endeavor, to make the corner-stone laying a presentable affair. Many Protestants had contributed generously to his funds in a neighborly way, and had requested that opportunity be furnished them to view the ceremony from an advantageous position. The priest foresaw anything but edification from the function as it was usually performed; and, as his parish lines lay near our seminary, he obtained permission for a dozen of our boys to attend and to sing the psalms and other chants required. It fell to my lot, of course, to drill them. Here is the point of my illustration; for I am thoroughly convinced that the only secure safeguard against a musical fracas is the most minute preparatory attention to matters of detail. I accordingly had the psalms typewritten, and multiplied so that each student should possess a copy. In every one of the twelve copies I inserted, with no little expenditure of time and labor, the appropriate marks for breathing and for mediation and cadence. Then came the rehearsals, and, finally, the public chanting. I claim no credit for the extraordinarily beautiful effect achieved, save that which Guidetti claimed for his own editorial labors, namely, that they had produced a work 'nullius quidem ingenii, multarum tamen vigiliarum.' This edifying ceremonial was most favorably commented upon not alone by the assisting clergy, who relinquished their customary rôle to the students with spontaneous delight, but especially by the 'separated brethren,' whose reverence for the ancient ceremonial of the Catholic Church was thus pleasingly invited."

"And for my part I do not see," said Boyton, "why the services should go 'by turns' in our parish churches. Rather would it seem desirable that selection be made of the most

appropriate men for the particular thing that is to be done. If a priest be gifted with a peculiarly strong legal sense, and is thus fitted for teaching Canon Law, we don't set him at teaching Latin in our seminaries; neither, because a man is a very cultivated Latinist, do we set him at teaching Dogmatic Theology. Why, then, if he be peculiarly gifted as a preacher, do we not imitate the example of our European brethren, and make him Dompredigier, instead of having him 'take his turn' singing, mayhap, the glorious *Exsultet* on Holy Saturday—a task for which he may be wondrously unfitted; while to some young and inexperienced and bashful and hesitating priest we assign, 'by turn,' the sermon on Easter Sunday. Why, in short, don't we strive rather to put our best foot forward in the public services of the Church and cease ignoring the manifest discriminations of nature, which endows one man with elocutionary grace and attractiveness, another man with a melodious voice, fine musical appreciation and devout habit of mind, another with a faculty for comprehensiveness of ceremonial detail, and so on. This last would naturally serve as a permanent Master of Ceremonies, the first as a frequent—possibly a permanent—preacher, and the second man as musical overseer in the Church. But no—everything must be 'by turn,' with the result of manifest misfits and general inappropriateness."

The meeting was evidently degenerating into a Personal Views Club. It was the Bishop who recalled it to a practical purpose:

"Father Julius's suggestion seems feasible and desirable. The seminary is the heart of a diocese; and good taste in Church music must be engendered there. However, there lies behind that—chronologically at least, if not logically—the view of musical taste imparted in the mother-houses of our religious orders to the teachers in our parish schools. The training of our young ones in music, as in other branches, is surely a matter of importance. If both of these, seminary and religious mother-house, adopt sane views of Church music, the question will ultimately solve itself, quietly and effectively.

Meanwhile much can be done, doubtless. And first of all, the rubrics requiring the singing, or at least the recitation, of the Gradual texts—the Introits, Graduals, etc.—should be carried out. There must be great difficulties to encounter here, from a musical standpoint, if I may judge from the practice of our churches in this matter."

Father James exhausted five minutes in describing Dr. Sterne's success. "His result," he concluded, "like that described by Father Julius in the case of the corner-stone laying, was attained only by much exercise of energy and foresight. But he took the necessary trouble, and the result *was* attained."

The conversation becoming thus anecdotal in character, Boyton thereupon treated the Bishop to a highly-colored account of our memorable evening at St. Bartholomew's, while Father James contributed some details of the tripartite discussions that took place subsequently among the three of us—himself, Mr. Merrill, and myself.

"Now, Father James, why not put all this in a little book for a perpetual reminder?" said the Bishop. "The narrative covers almost everything in the *Motu proprio*, and it seems to me that the lessons imparted are not idle ones."

"But consider, Bishop, the many preoccupations of us poor pastors," he said, with a dolorous air; "and furthermore, think of my technical unpreparedness for stating in exact language the problems involved in Church music. 'Rogo te, habe me excusatum,'" he concluded with a pleasant grimace.

"Martin's the lad for us," burst in Boyton, with his customary enthusiasm. "He has been with all the actors in the various scenes of our bucolic drama, and can faithfully and accurately set down whatever is worth recording 'in perpetuam rei memoriam.' Besides, he is luckily free of any parish duties for a few months—"

"It is true that, through the kindness of the Bishop, I have been set free from those duties for a few brief months," I interrupted; "but if you persist in putting such a burden on my weak shoulders, I can hardly consider my vacation a 'lucky' one."

"Tut, man, it will amuse you," rejoined Boyton.

"Think twice before you refuse," added Father James.

"Perhaps it would amuse me," I said, "if I be allowed to set down, without fear or favor, everything that took place in our discussion"—and I looked meaningly at Boyton. He understood me, and laughing, said:

"Oh, don't spare me a whit, if you only put in all the foolishness you have also heard from Dr. Magnus."

Magnus glowered at Boyton; Father James chuckled audibly; while Father Bernard and Professor Marks glanced at each other uneasily.

"Well," said the Bishop pleasantly, not noticing the little sideplays going on, "there remains only the title—and what should that be?"

"There's only one title that would fit," said Boyton, looking roguishly at the alarmed faces around him. "We have quarreled so much here and elsewhere on the theme, that Father Martin has no recourse but to style his narrative "A CLERICAL STORY OF SIXES AND SEVENS."

[THE END.]

SOME OLD ENGLISH WEDDING CUSTOMS.

II.

MARRIAGE LICENSE.

REFERENCE was made in my previous article[1] to the origin and prudence of the custom of the publication of the banns. I will now mention an official document of Charles I's reign which was found in the old parish chest of Luccombe, in Somerset. It was a marriage license, issued by William, Bishop of Bath and Wells, on 12 March, 1627. The contracting parties were John Bryant, tailor, and Jane Jurdan, spinster. The body of the document is in Latin, but at the end is added in English: "If you knowe anie lawfull impediment to the contrary wherefore the said parties ought not to

[1] August number, pp. 115-116.

be lawfully joyned together in matrimony, you are not to procede to the solemnization thereof, these presents notwithstandinge."

Liturgical Color for Marriage Vestments.

The use of colored vestments is contemporaneous with the use of any special vestments at all. The chasuble is but the offspring of the "paenula consularis," just as the Greek vestments are but the reproduction of the dress of the Emperors. The old "stola" became the surplice or alb. And a study of the liturgical colors observed in England during pre-Reformation ages shows that throughout those centuries a type of sequence prevailed all over England essentially the same, but with a few local variations, mostly of no importance. When, however, we turn to the matter of liturgical colors in its bearing upon holy Matrimony we do not find the rule to be rigid and definite. For, three colors appear to have been used somewhat indifferently at the Sacrament of Marriage. They were white, green, and blue. And the first two would appear to have been more general than the last. The Votive Mass of the Holy Trinity, which always followed the spousals and wedding, may give a clue to the colors. In 1518 there was at Wycombe "a cope with white roses, called the Wedding Cope with [tunicles for] deacon and subdeacon." This was evidently not white, as the roses must have been of a different color from the ground of the cope. There was also a "vestment for a wedding, the cross of red velvet purled with gold." This also was, on similar grounds, probably not red. And if we could presume that cope, chasuble, and tunicles, were all of the same color, it would follow that the suit was neither white nor red. But such an assumption is hardly safe, judging by all we know of medieval customs. It is worthy of note, however, that the priest in the representation of "Matrimony" on the Font at Great Witchingham, is wearing a green stole. And as green was generally held to symbolize fruitfulness, it is not inappropriate to a wedding. Moreover, in the Innocentian Sequence, which occurs in the

sixty-fourth chapter of Innocent's book, *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, and belongs to the close of the twelfth century, we find this direction: "Finally, on ferial and common days *green* vestments should be used." The old Roman symbolical colors were: *fuscus* (a dark color), the sign of mourning; *purpureus* and gold, signs of dignity; and white, a sign of festivity. And when we consider that white was also an emblem of virgin purity, how suitable to the occasion is white at a wedding! Our Lord referred to Matrimony as figurative of the close and indissoluble union which exists between Him and His Church (the Bride). And blue was symbolical of fidelity, as appears in the following couplet, sent by a lady to her lover, together with "a blew lace with a treu love," about 1537:

I have sente you blewe
Bycause you should be trew.

The Marriage Service.

An old English custom at weddings was for the priest to be vested as for Mass, but without his chasuble. And the marriage was celebrated in the porch.[2] Such was the case in the marriage by proxy of Charles I to Henrietta Maria, which was celebrated at the door of Notre Dame, Paris. But, in the representation of a marriage on the font at Great Witchingham (to which reference has been made already) the man and woman stand in the body of the church, and not in the porch, as the old rubric had it. And if the wedding-ring had not been blessed before, the priest blessed it when the man laid it on the book. The ring used to be put on the woman's right-hand, but Crammer's German astrologer influenced him to make the alteration to the left-hand, which the Catholic Church now follows.[3] The ring was placed on the thumb at the words "of the Father," on the index-finger at "of the

[2] This custom is said to have been derived from the Etrusians, who were always married in the street, the door of the house being thrown open at the conclusion of the ceremony.

[3] *Rituale Romanum Pauli V Pontificis Maximi iussu editum*, Mechliniae, 1870, p. 288.

Son," on the third finger at "of the Holy Ghost," and then finally left on the fourth finger at the "Amen."

The psalm "Beati omnes" was said during the procession up to the altar. And, in many places, it was customary for the bride and bridegroom to hold a lighted candle each. In the old rites, during the Votive Mass of the Holy Trinity, the man and woman were directed to stand on the right-hand side of the church, at the "presbytery" or "sedilia," the woman on the right of the man (i. e. between him and the altar). A rubric[4] notes that if they are censed it must be with unblessed incense, for the clergy and people must never be censed with incense that has been blessed. At the Offertory the bride and bridegroom offered their candles. At the Sanctus in the bridal Mass the couple came before the altar and there knelt at the step, while four "clerks" (clerics) held the "carecloth" over them, unless one of them had been married before. This was removed after the Pater Noster, and just before the "Kiss of Peace" (or "Pax"), which was given to the man direct by the priest, and then the man gave it direct to the woman and no other. In the York use, the carecloth was held only by two priests, but according to the Sarum use it was held at its four corners by four priests. They had at St. Margaret's, Southwark, in 1485, a carecloth of green silk with divers beasts of white.[5]

Rule for the Trousseau.

Some sort of code of regulations regarding the trousseau seems to have been recognized. There is a common saying in Lancashire that a bride should wear at her wedding:

> Something old and something new,
> Something borrowed and something blue.

The bridal veil is but a relic[6] of the carecloth, which was (as has already been stated) enjoined by both the Sarum and

[4] *Missale Sarum*, 838.

[5] *British Magazine*, 1848, xxxiii, 16.

[6] Cfr. *Notes and Queries*, No. 182.

York uses, but also was held over the bridal pair even in Saxon times. Brides were married with the tresses flowing. It was formerly the custom for the bride to go to church with her hair hanging loose behind. Anne Boleyn had her hair down when she was led to the altar by Henry VIII. John Webster, an English dramatist of the seventeenth century, refers to this custom, in his play "The White Devil":

> And let them dangle loose as a bride's hair.

Bridal chaplets, nuptial garlands, or wedding wreaths, are of great antiquity. They were equally used by the Jews and pagans. The Roman custom was for the bride to have a chaplet of flowers (or herbs) upon her head. In the Greek Church the chaplet worn by the bride was first blessed by the priest. Among our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, the bride and bridegroom were, after the Benediction in the church, crowned with flowers. And in Henry VIII's time wedding wreaths made of ears of corn were frequently worn by brides. Rosemary and myrtle were also much used for this purpose. It is said that in some countries the bride is crowned with a garland of "prickles" and so delivered to her husband, in order that he might realize that he had tied himself to a thorny pleasure.

Orange blossoms are used in China as the Chinese have from time immemorial regarded this plant as an emblem of good fortune. And the Saracen brides used orange blossoms in their personal decoration at their wedding, as these blossoms were supposed to signify fruitfulness. The following has been suggested as the origin of the prevalence of orange blossoms for nuptial garlands in pagan countries: the orange was the golden apple of Juno which grew in the garden of the Hesperides, and that as the golden apple was presented by that goddess to Jupiter on their wedding day, so orange blossoms now adorn our brides. It is probable that this custom was first introduced into Western Europe by the Crusaders. In Germany, only chaste maidens were permitted the privilege of wearing the wedding wreath.

In many churches it was usual to keep a crown of metal or paste for the use of brides and for which they would pay a small fee. In the Church-warden's Accounts of St. Margaret's, Westminster, for 1540, is the following entry: "Paid to Alice Lewis, a goldsmith's wife, of London, for a serclett [circlet] to marry Maydens in, the 26th day of September, £3-10-0." And again, in an inventory made by the church-wardens of all the goods, jewels, and ornaments, in the same church of St. Margaret's, Westminster, A. D. 1562, we find: "Item. A past for bird [i. e. a paste for a bride] set with pearl and stone." This one was the property of the parish, and was bought in 1540 for £3.

A strange part of the trousseau equipment was the dagger worn by the bride. Knives formerly formed a part of the habiliments of a bride. This is accounted for by the fact that anciently a knife sheathed and suspended from the girdle formed a part of the dress for women. A bride says to her jealous husband, in Dekker's "Match me in London" (1631):

> See at my girdle hang my wedding knives!
> With those despatch me.

The Nuptial Torch.

The use of torches at weddings dates from very remote times. The Greeks used a nuptial torch which was carried by the bride's mother at the wedding. At Rome it was the custom for two children to lead the bride, and a third carried before her a torch of white thorn. Lamps and flambeaux are carried at Japanese weddings; and torches are still to be seen at Turkish marriages.

Bridal favors are but a relic of the ribbons and garters of the bride, which used to be contended for and proudly worn by the lucky possessor.

> She is not fair to outward view,
> As many maidens be;
> Her loveliness I never knew
> Until she smiled on me.
> Oh, then I saw her eye was bright,
> A well of love, a spring of light.—Coleridge.

The custom of bridesmaids at weddings is also of early origin. Amongst the Anglo-Saxons the bride was led to the church by a matron who was called the bride's woman, and followed by a company of young girls, who were called bride's maids. At one time, it was the custom for the bride's maids to lead the bridegroom to the church, and for the bridegroom's men to conduct the bride. We have an allusion to this custom in the "Collier's Wedding":

> Two lusty lads, well drest and strong,
> Step'd out to lead the bride along:
> And two young maids of equal size,
> As soon the bridegroom's hands surprise.

The bridegroom's men were called bride knights, which was an appropriate name in the days when they actually fulfilled that office.

ORIGIN OF THE "LOVERS' KNOT."

Amongst the ancient northern nations, a knot was regarded as the symbol of love, faith, and friendship, pointing out, as it were, the indissoluble tie of affection and duty. Hence it is that knots or bows of ribbon came to be used as wedding favors, a particular form of which came to be known as the the true lovers' knot. The peasantry of France wore the bridal favor on the arm, whereas in England it was formerly worn on the hat, and consisted of ribbons of various colors. In later years white alone has been used. It was customary in many places for the priest to entwine the ends of his stole round the joined hands of the bride and bridegroom at the words "Those whom God has joined together," in token of the indissoluble union thereby effected. But neither the Roman nor the Sarum Missals contain any direction for this ritual, which would appear to be a pure innovation on the part of some of the English clergy.

> But love is indestructible. Its holy flame for ever burneth.
> From heaven it came, to heaven returneth.
> Too oft on earth a troubled guest;
> At times deceived, at times opprest;
> It here is tried and purified,
> And hath in heaven its perfect rest.—SOUTHEY.

THE "BRIDAL CUP" AND "NUPTIAL DRINKING."

The custom of nuptial drinking appears to have prevailed in the Greek Church. And the Jews have a custom at the present day of breaking the bridal cup after the bride and bridegroom have drunk out of it, to remind them of mortality. The drinking of wine in the church at weddings is enjoined by both the Hereford Missal and the Sarum Missal. But the Sarum Missal directs that the "Sop" (bread immersed in wine), the wine, and the bridal cup be first blessed by the priest; and that both the wine and the sop be partaken of not only by the bride and bridegroom, but by the whole company. St. Lawrence's Church, Reading, had a curious bridal cup which was carried before all brides who were married in that church. A distinct revival of this custom, but in a debased form, lingered beyond the middle of the nineteenth century, at Whitburn, in Durham, where the custom of giving what was called "Hot-Pots" was kept up. That is, on the conclusion of the marriage service, the bride and bridegroom were served in the porch of the church with steaming compounds of brandy, ale, sugar, eggs, spices, etc. The bridesmaids also partook of this, and the remainder was distributed among the guests.

"MAZER" (OR "MASER") BOWL.

This popular drinking vessel was a homely bowl of maple (or mottled) wood, highly polished by use, and much esteemed for its fantastic veining. The mazer appeared not only on the table of the "noble," but every "franklin," and every artisan possessed one among his household treasures. It was encircled with godly mottoes, or with such welcomes and hearty good wishes as those with which Englishmen loved to greet their gossips; and at the bottom was often represented the figure of St. Christopher, which every Bacchanalian did his best to uphold. Mazers were also made of gold, silver, and some enriched with enamel. Several are to be seen in the South Kensington Museum, London. The mazer was round in form and similar to the more ancient "Was-

sail bowl;" but whilst the latter was for occasions of great festivity, the former was in constant domestic requisition, the mazers being placed at intervals along the table.

> Ther was wine ful clere,
> In mony a fure [fair] Mazere,
> And other drynkes that were dere,
> In copes [cups] ful grete.
> —WARTON'S *History of Poetry*, Vol. II.

We often meet with mazer cups in old inventories, but these were the little mazers called "Godards." The large ones were called "standing-mazers"; thus one belonging to Henry VI, of England, is described as "a standing-mazer of silver and gilt, with the arms of England and France, and writ with a poyse of Good Edward." There is still at Pilton church, Somerset, an ancient standing-mazer to serve for brides at their weddings. This was in compliance with the rubric of the Sarum manual: "Post Missam benedicatur panis et vinum vel aliud quid potabile in vasculo, et gustent in nomine Domini Sacerdote dicente Dom. Vobiscum. Oremus."

THE NUPTIAL KISS.

In the English Church, in pre-Reformation times, the nuptial kiss was a solemn ceremony, enjoined by both the Sarum and York uses. And, although it has, in the English Church, long ceased to be a regular portion of the Marriage service, still in many rural districts it is customary for the bridegroom to kiss the bride while they are before the altar and in sight of the assembled congregation. At Halse, a village in Somerset, it is still a recognized custom among the laboring classes for the bridegroom after he has placed the ring on the bride's finger to take her in his arms and kiss her fervently, and it is somewhat remarkable that, instead of this causing any amusement among the spectators, it is treated as a solemnity, and would certainly appear to be a distinct survival of the nuptial kiss. A similar custom still prevails, also, at Bishops Lydeard, in Somerset. In the works of Shakespeare are many references to the kissing customs of his day. Much time was

spent at taverns, and it was usual to courteously salute the hostess, a custom alluded to in the "Merry Wives of Windsor." Hence it was that the popularity of an inn depended in a measure upon the attractions of the hostess or her daughters.

Wedding-Ring.

It is impossible to trace the origin of the wedding-ring which is variously ascribed, first, to a link of the fetters which women wore in token of subjection; second, to a portion of the price paid for the bride to her father or brothers; and thirdly, to the endlessness of the love which they were supposed to have inspired. There is no doubt, however, that the use of the wedding-ring dates back to ancient pagan times. Wedding-rings were used both by the Greeks and Romans, but then only at the ceremony of betrothal, and not that of the marriage. Among the Anglo-Saxons the bridegroom gave to the bride, at the betrothal, a "wed" (or pledge), and a ring was placed on the maiden's right-hand where it remained until the marriage when it was transferred to the left-hand. In Germany, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, it was a common custom for the engaged couple each to give to the other a plain gold ring, much resembling a wedding ring. One of the earliest forms was the "gemel," or double ring, and this was used as a pledge before marriage. It was generally made in three parts, and broken in the presence of a witness, who retained the third part.

Origin of the Choice of the Wedding Finger.

The custom of placing the ring on the third finger (the fourth including the thumb) of the left-hand is of remote antiquity. Aulus Gellius, who wrote in the second century of our era, tells us that the Romans wore the ring on the third finger of the left-hand, and the reason assigned was the belief that there is a vein in this (third) finger of the left-hand which proceeds straight to the heart. But this custom has been traced through Aulus Gellius (A. D. 150), and Apion (A. D. 40), to the remote times of Egyptian antiquity. The

left-hand was most probably chosen because virgins who were espoused to the Church wore the ring of their celestial nuptials on the right-hand. During the reigns of George I and George II the wedding ring was often worn on the thumb. And in the eighteenth century, wedding rings were frequently inscribed with "poesys" (posies). Dr. John Thomas, who was Bishop of Lincoln in 1753, married four times. The posy (or motto) on the wedding ring at his fourth marriage was:

If I survive
I'll make them five.

And Henry VIII gave Anne of Cleves a ring with the posy:

God send me well to keep.

EVE'S CONJUGAL LOVE.

My author and disposer, what thou bid'st,
Unargued I obey: so God ordains;
God is thy law, thou mine: to know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge, and her praise.
With thee conversing I forget all time,
All seasons and their change, all please alike.

—MILTON.

BRIDE CAKE.

The wedding-cake is also of ancient origin. It played an important part in Roman weddings, where "confarreatio," or eating together, formed a binding ceremony. In the Roman period the marriage consisted chiefly of the contracting couple partaking of a cake (made of flour, salt, and water) in the presence of the Pontifex Maximus, and ten witnesses. The hallowed cake of the ancient Britons of which whosoever ate had a vision that night of the man or woman whom heaven designed should be their wedded partner, has given place to the wedding cake itself. Feasting has been connected with nearly all religious ceremonies, and, as each feast speedily appropriated its particular article of food, the bridal cake became inseparably associated with the bridal feast. Ben Jonson refers to it in his "Tale of a Tub," iii, 8:

> The maids and her half-valentine have ply'd her,
> With courtise of the bride-cake and the bowl,
> As she is laid awhile.

Both the form and the ingredients of the bride cake have doubtless changed from age to age; but there is little doubt that the cake was always a sweet one, which in the early days would be sweetened with honey and spices, and (after their introduction) with currants.

KISS OVER THE BRIDAL CAKE.

In the seventeenth century a pretty custom prevailed, in which the newly-married couple further pledged their "troth" to one another, by the bride and bridegroom kissing each other over the bride cake.

JOHN R. FRYAR.

Cambridge, England.

THE SYLLABUS.

THE OLD SYLLABUS.

WHEN, forty-three years ago, Pius IX published his famous "Syllabus" in connexion with the Encyclical *Quanta cura,* there arose protests from governments and from public men against the stringency of the doctrines and the reactionary effect these were likely to have upon modern political and scientific progress. Yet the "Syllabus" of 1864 was nothing more than a collection of propositions containing various ethical and doctrinal errors, which had already been, separately and distinctly, censured in the published Encyclicals and Allocutions of Pius IX; and they were here merely brought together so as to serve the interpreters of Catholic doctrine as an index of the Church's mind, exhibited in the utterances of her chief spokesman, on questions of the day. Each proposition offered a text which might be (like the texts for sermons taken from the Gospels) elaborated in the light of the documentary context wherein it had originally appeared, and made to illuminate Catholic truth according to the exigencies and varying occasions of time, place, and the

capacity of the faithful. A dozen or more of these texts were embodied in the Encyclical *Quanta cura* itself; and thence arose those animated scholastic discussions as to the extent to which the "Syllabus" might be considered to be an *ex cathedra* pronouncement possessing the note of infallible truth. Viewed from the point of practical utility these disputes contributed little or nothing to the actual understanding and observance of the doctrine and discipline set forth in the document which, whether infallible or not, called for the Catholic's loyal assent to the obvious signification of each proposition. If there existed any reasonable doubt as to which of several possible meanings a clause might bear, Catholics were free to accept the widest interpretation compatible with what the Church had elsewhere clearly defined; and this despite the dicta of individual interpreters or theologians differing from one another in their views. The discussions were kept alive for upward of thirty years, as is demonstrated by the Abbé Vieville's *Le Syllabus Commenté,* a volume of nearly 500 pages published in 1879, and the more recent *Vindicia Syllabi,*[1] not to speak of the numerous controversial writings which dealt not so much with the text as with the tendency of the Syllabus, as represented by Newman's answer to Gladstone, or the differences of viewpoint taken by theologians like Cardinal Mazzella as against Hefele and others.

The Syllabus of Pius IX was regarded as a somewhat novel form of instruction addressed to the faithful by the sovereign teacher of Christendom. It stated what Catholics could not conscientiously accept in the place of sound interpretation of their faith, and what therefore they must refrain from teaching and endorsing. This method of censuring erroneous doctrines left untouched the broad freedom of interpretation which belongs to man by reason of his native endowments of intelligence and free will; and the wars waged in the theological schools bear witness to this freedom, even whilst men in

[1] 1897, Naples.

the exercise of it not infrequently lost sight of the principle of St. Augustine—*non pervenitur ad veritatem nisi per charitatem.* But the Church is not responsible for the *odium theologicum* generated in her schools any more than she is answerable for the other symptoms of weakness exhibited in her children whom she seeks to educate, or even in the teachers and executives to whom she commits the work of reform.

There had been earlier attempts to formulate such a chart of opinions to be avoided as the Syllabus of Pius IX represented. Cardinal Fornari had prepared "a list of errors" in doctrine and discipline which it was hoped would receive Pontifical sanction and be promulgated in connexion with the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1852. Later, in 1860, Bishop Gerbet of Perpignan published for his own diocese a syllabus of eighty-five propositions dealing with the errors of the day. The document became actually the model in form of the Syllabus which Pius IX promulgated in 1864 under the title of "Syllabus comprising the principal errors of our age, censured in the Consistories, Encyclical writings, and Apostolic Letters of His Holiness Pius IX." It dealt with a large range of topics that had during the previous half-century formed the staple of doctrine and discussion in the new schools of philosophy and politics. Thus it condemned the vagaries of pantheism, naturalism, and rationalism, as taught by Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and interpreted by Cousin, Jules Simon, and their less radical disciples. A distinct group of propositions had for its object to censure the various forms of indifferentism and latitudinarianism; others were levelled at socialism, communism, and certain liberalizing societies acting under the pretence of religious zeal. The political upheavals of Italy had turned the Pontiff's attention to the question of ecclesiastical rights, including the temporal sovereignty of the Pontiff. Accordingly a proportionate number of propositions dealt with this subject. Other errors which were stigmatized touched different questions of Christian morals, especially the modern aspects of Marriage and the sacramental safeguards of Catholic social and family life.

Somewhat different in scope and in tone from the Syllabus of Pius IX is the present Syllabus which, lacking the note of personal utterance, appears as the work of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition under the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff.

THE NEW SYLLABUS

broadly speaking, states the authoritative attitude of the Church toward modern errors propagated mainly, though not exclusively, within the fold. It is a disciplinary measure issued by her teaching authority (*magisterium*) for the guidance of those who profess allegiance to her doctrine and discipline. Its object is to serve on the one hand as a check to the unguarded defenders of novel theories which trench upon the domain of faith and morals, and on the other as a guide to the consistent Christian who may find himself in doubt about the safety of doctrines that appeal to him by their plausibility, yet rouse his suspicion by their novelty and apparent divergence from established truths and principles, as hitherto interpreted by tradition.

The immediate purpose of the new Syllabus is not to instruct theologians, but to safeguard the faithful. Hence, any attempt to subject the different propositions to the straining process of critical analysis, or to apply to their interpretation those minute distinctions which seem to be the prerogative of the schools, would frustrate the straightforward intention of the Sovereign Pontiff at whose instigation a commission of the S. Inquisition was appointed to draw up this Syllabus. The principal aim of the document is clearly enough indicated in the brief introductory, which states that these errors are censured because they *are daily spreading among the faithful, threatening to take root in the minds of Catholic people, and thereby corrupting the purity of their faith.*[2]

[2] Ne vero hujus generis errores, qui quotidie inter fideles sparguntur, in eorum animis radices figant ac fidei sinceritatem corrumpant, placuit SSmo. D. N. Pio, ut per hoc S. R. et U. Inquisitionis officium, ii qui inter eos praecipui essent, notarentur et reprobarentur.—*Decr., Intro.*

It is true that many of the propositions in the new Syllabus suggest the censure of current writings which, though unnamed here, are understood to be identified with the teaching of men who, by their proficiency in historical learning and scientific investigation, occupy an intellectual position above the masses. But it is also apparent that the modern methods and means which render the conclusions of these scholars popular have greatly increased, and that a less gifted and indiscriminate reading public is apt to be indoctrinated with tenets, the reasons or motives and merits of which it cannot grasp or fairly judge of. Every thoughtful man knows that those zealots who are least adequately prepared by previous systematic study to demonstrate a theory will be the most eager to support what their partial knowledge commends. It is much easier to declaim in the name of science, by quoting the words of a master, than to support a given statement by the demonstrated exercise of sound and correct judgment. And since the fact that a man is learned and has made many experiments does not necessarily render all his conclusions certain, even when they are very plausible, it is but just that our children and the simple-minded folk among us be prevented from blindly "swearing by the words of the individual teacher," whenever there are reasons to fear that his conclusions are either doubtful or dangerous to their peace of mind.

Such reasons exist whenever men of equal learning or of sound judgment differ in their conclusions drawn from the same or kindred premises. It is not necessary for a man to be a scientist or an experimentalist to understand the value of scientific conclusions; in truth, no man is more in danger of overestimating the worth of special investigations than he who has made them. They are his offspring and so he loves them, exaggerates their weight and their utility; and as his has been the hard labor of establishing them he is naturally reluctant to admit the criticism that would show them to be inconclusive or erroneous. Nevertheless in the case of the scientist, as of the genius, we most often find verified what

is said of men in general, namely, that the public takes each of them at his own valuation. It is a fallacy of common human weakness. Under these circumstances there must be some court of appeal whose judges are more broad-minded than the individual to decide, if not upon the intrinsic or absolute correctness of scientific conclusions, at least upon the value of their indiscriminate application, their probable weight as compared with other testimony of a different or contrary tendency, and of the good or harm they may effect when taught to the people. For a conclusion may be theoretically true, yet its application to actual circumstances may be inopportune or, what is worse, hurtful, because the occasions for misapplications happen to be unduly rife. It may be said therefore that when a learned man appraises his discovery, and his friends and admirers conspire to advertise it in his behalf as a new truth, the general public is much in the position of an audience to whom an eloquent lecturer announces a new remedy of ancient ills. The very novelty of the discovery causes an exaggerated statement of its value, and when its adoption has become the fashion, those who doubt are apt to be decried as adherents of an old school or as obscurantists. Time passes, and the panacea of yesterday is superseded by a fresh nostrum, whilst the reasons which approve the new are the reasons that condemn the old. Let one examine the records of the history of political economy, of exegesis, of experimental science—and with these the Syllabus happens to deal—and he will find that the popular theories of one age have invariably created a reactionary theory in the next quite as popular as the contradictory one that preceded it. Monarchism and republicanism, private interpretation of Scripture and the higher criticism, spontaneous generation and the germ theory, furnish instances of economical, Biblical, and scientific views of diametrically opposite philosophical schools claiming almost universal sway for a time as the only evidence and possible solution of existing problems.

Who is to settle the practical difficulties arising out of the conflict of minds? In the secular commonwealth it is the

State authority, with due regard to the existing political forms and the circumstances which make legislation effective. In the religious commonwealth it is the Church.

Competency of the Church to Point out Scientific Error.

The objection is frequently raised that, in proscribing the works of writers who have made special historical or scientific research for the purpose of throwing light upon modern questions, particularly of Scripture and of doctrine, the Church authorities use mere repressive power against the quite distinct claims of reason and intelligence. Thus, to take the present Syllabus as an instance, a few churchmen represented by the Inquisition, with Pius X, who lays no claim to special scientific training, as their president, agree to stigmatize as erroneous the published investigations of the Abbé Loisy, a life-long student in the field of the Scriptures and of dogma. It is as if a jury of common laborers, however intelligent and honest they may be, were to sit in judgment on the scientific merits of the physiological tests of a Leipzig specialist, whose laboratory apparatus for investigating and observing the manifestations of animal and psychic life secure for him results not easily accessible to the ordinary student. In other words, an unprofessional jury undertakes to pronounce judgment upon the merits of expert scientific testimony.

The objection would have weight if we had here a perfect analogy. The Roman jury of the Inquisition does not pretend to pronounce sentence upon expert scientific testimony, but rather upon the very commonplace moral effects which are certain to result from the teaching of such testimony if spread broadcast among those who are not qualified to discriminate between a scientific hypothesis and an ascertained fact. The Syllabus deals with the value of the results assumed as demonstrated by the individual scientist, not with the correctness of the processes by which he may have reached them. The object of the Church is to safeguard the truth of things and the possession of truths of which she has

been assured by a far higher Intelligence than that of a commission of theologians such as compose the Inquisition. That a scientist, however learned or conscientious he may be, should rob a Christian mind of the motives of credibility upon which divine revelation rests, and give him in return nothing but the assurance of individual talent and labor, is admitting a principle which subverts the very fundamentals of sane evidence, unless we relinquish the testimony of revealed religion entirely.

Whenever we meet with a statement accepted as actual fact by the authorities of the Church, and maintained as fact against the contrary assertion of the scientist, either such fact is vouched for by divine revelation or its contrary assumption is not sufficiently demonstrated by science to warrant the sacrifice of an established tradition. Such is the case with regard to the theories, lately repudiated by the authorities of the Church, touching the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Her censure of both theories means in the first place that the champions of the new theory have merely criticized the old tradition without proving conclusively that it is erroneous. In other words, they have not brought positive proof of sufficient weight to equal that on which the traditional belief rests. Hence that belief must stand. The Church authorities do not add "for the present," simply because, since there is no sufficient reason to accept the new exegesis or new theology as more than a mere hypothesis, any prognosis of what science may prove hereafter is out of place. The unbiased critic will recognize this truth on examination of the facts in every single case. The Church may have reasons to alter her disciplinary laws, as any society may, but whilst she makes them for present conditions they are absolute and presently binding.

It is plain, then, that a competent jury in such cases need not possess expert learning to pass sound judgment upon the practical effects which certain doctrines must exercise upon the moral and religious life of the community, or to decide whether and how far a newly claimed doctrine contradicts an

established truth of a higher order. One might, indeed, quote historical evidence to show that narrow judgments of potent churchmen occasionally limit the free exercise of genius. The case of Galileo is a favorite one with the advocates of individual rights as against the abuse of ecclesiastical rule. To make such incidents the basis of an argument against the beneficent purpose and action of an institution like the Inquisition appears to us very much the same as if one inveighed against the supreme courts of justice, because it can be shown that such courts have occasionally erred in pronouncing judgment. Unless we make the Inquisition an infallible tribunal, we must expect that it is liable to issue judgments that may possibly be reversed at some future time. But the existence of such a possibility neither suspends the judgments of a legal tribunal nor creates any presumption that its decisions are not as a rule just and true.

To confine ourselves to the application of this test of the justice of the censures implied in the Syllabus, we should find it in sooth difficult to select a more representative body of educated and liberal-minded judges than the commission appointed to examine the ethical, Biblical, and theological theories and doctrines of modern times, and to pass judgment as to whether and in what sense these theories imply a subversion of established principles and truths maintained in the apostolic deposit of Catholic faith. The Inquisition consists of about fifty members, among whom are some thirty consultors, heads for the most part of religious communities, of universities and learned academies, who have attained their positions in nearly every case by fully demonstrated ability through long years spent both in teaching and in actual administration. Practically every order and nationality has its representatives in this body—Father David Fleming, the English Franciscan, P. Cormier, the French Dominican, Wernz, the German Jesuit, the two latter being the Generals of their respective Orders. Besides these there are the officials called qualificators and archivists, who directly serve the consultors, read, revise, ascertain facts, verify, compare, and collate the results. These

men do not do their work hastily. In the present case they have been working for two years. The conclusions of their labors are tabulated, again examined, and finally submitted to the judgment of the tribunal which has at its head ten or more cardinals, men of exceptional learning, of tried experience, and of conscientious appreciation of the responsibility to the public which their judgment involves. That the Sovereign Pontiff, head of a body whose pronounced tendencies are in favor of vindicating the good name of the Church as the protector of learning no less than as the guardian of faith, should assume any other than a most liberal and benevolent attitude in reviewing the tenets that claim the patronage of science, seems contrary to every fair view of the case. Cardinals Rampolla, Gotti, Ferrata, Serafino Vannutelli, Merry del Val, Respighi, Steinhuber, Segna, Vives y Tuto, who form the chief judges of the Inquisition, are not men who would lay themselves open to the charge of patronizing obscurantism, unless it were demanded by the evident duty of defending the fundamental principles of Christian doctrine and discipline. There are, of course, those who believe that the doctrines of the Gospels are obscurantism, and that the principles which Christ characterized as heavenly wisdom should be revised to give place to the utilitarian wisdom of the world which He pronounced to be folly. In her own domain the Church must remain judge of these things; and the preservation of faith and of morals through religious discipline is eminently the province of the Church. To carry out effectually this work of safeguarding her subjects from the aggressive enterprises of those who, under the guise of intellectual progress, sincere though they be, threaten to destroy the life of faith, the Church has her organs of government, one of which is the Inquisition, and these organs issue their laws, warnings, directions, as in this case of the Syllabus.

A Board of Moral Health.

The functions of the Inquisition and the meaning of the Syllabus will perhaps be best understood if we compare them

to similar institutions in the civil order. Republican government is not supposed to interfere with individual rights. Its object is rather to promote the contentment and prosperity of its subjects. It promotes science and individual enterprise, and secures the rights of competitive action by legislation, sometimes restrictive, sometimes punitive. It also provides for the physical well-being of its subjects within certain limits. Among the measures adopted for this purpose there are Boards of Health, whose functions are, on the one hand, to prevent the rise and spreading of disease, and on the other hand to promote the use of wholesome food-stuffs to the exclusion of adulterated products which we owe to the progress of science and to the commercial enterprise of individuals and of companies. Now the Board of Health claims, and justly, to forbid the indiscriminate emptying into public streams or highways, of garbage, or chemical matter, or animal products, which might infect the common air or water; and this even when such products are the necessary concomitant of important scientific or commercial enterprise. Again, the Board of Health deems it a duty to protect the public against the thousand and one doubtful and noxious food preparations which commend themselves to the housewife as labor-saving, cheap, and palatable, not to speak of the fact that they are promotive of invention as well as of industry. Does the average citizen complain of violation of his personal rights because he is confronted in public places with an inscription "Please do not spit," or because he receives a list from the Department of Public Health warning him that the "absolutely pure baking soda" is adulterated with arsenic or other hurtful ingredients? The manufacturer of these products may cry out against such legislation because it puts an embargo on scientific experimentation of benefit to mankind by proposing to feed it more economically, or because it interferes with the individual right of a citizen to poison himself comfortably. But a sensible economist will conclude that the government's vigilance is beneficent in its purpose and advantageous in its net results. Even if the Board of Health

were, through the fanaticism of one or other of its members, at times to pass some extreme measure or injure some individual or private interest, we should not interpret such action as indicative of the uselessness or injuriousness of the principle and method of hygienic protection.

Now the Inquisition is nothing more or less than the Board of Health of the Church. Its functions are, of course, in the moral order. It examines the poisonous products of modern inventions which the intellectual enterprise of scholars throws upon the market, or into the streams of popular education. It warns the citizens of the religious commonwealth which the Church represents, and it forbids under censure the pollution of public places, or the manufacture and sale of noxious products that would infect the moral health of her subjects. In regard to some things prohibited we can conceive of changed conditions that would remove the noxious character of these things when applied in a different way. But as it is, they are hurtful to the public, and without issuing an infallible verdict in a matter which does not require such assurance, the Church claims the right of demanding obedience, such as an intelligently directed will gives to a disciplinary command, or even warning, issued for the common good. The Syllabus is a list of adulterated food products, the result of scientific experiment, but not on that account the less injurious to the health of heart and mind.

Categories of Errors.

To obtain a better survey of the kinds of adulterated and poisonous mental food products of which the Syllabus forms an instructive, if summary, list, the sixty-five propositions or errors which it contains may be grouped under five heads. There are false teachings about the functions of authority, of written revelation, of apostolic tradition, of dogmatic integrity and unity, and of the development of doctrine. They deal with principles, or with facts, or simply with effects. They may not censure a proposition in its separate parts, but only in its entirety, for the parts may be true, and yet the

composition false. Salt is one of the most helpful factors of nutrition, yet chlorine which forms part of it causes almost instant death when absorbed separately by the vital organs.

Thus, through the Syllabus of the Inquisition, the Church in her capacity as guardian of the faith proscribes loose views about authority, ecclesiastical and civil, since she understands that all authority is from God. She vindicates the value of accredited divine revelation upon which faith must build up its confidence in the future. She repudiates the assumption of the individual to interpret the laws of faith and discipline, which have the sanction of ages, by the mere notions of a new philosophical theory, or to give up the acquired historical bases of moral law and rectitude merely because of the assertions that they are disproved by analogy and the existence of myths and fables which resemble the facts of sacred history. The careful student of these propositions will easily recognize that the Church does not condemn a free interpretation of historical evidence, as, for example, in Scripture, where there is warrant for relinquishing a literal for a figurative sense.

There is abundant evidence in the utterances and acts of both Pius X and those who act under his chief authority, that the government of the Church is anxious to advance the interests of science in all its domains; but also to maintain that first of prerogatives and duties which her position as Christ's representative entails—namely, to advance the principles of sound ethics and religion, and to make education not merely the vehicle of intellectual prowess (which may lead to fatal errors), but also of that highest culture which Christian civilization represents, only because it has been moved by Christian principles as taught in the Gospel and the doctrinal code of the Church.

In a next article we hope to consider some of the leading propositions of the Syllabus in their main bearing upon Catholic teaching and practice.

Analecta.

EX ACTIS SUMMI PONTIFICIS.

FACULTAS BENEDICENDI CORONAS "CRUCIGERORUM" CONCEDITUR SACERDOTIBUS QUI NOMEN DEDERINT "ASSOCIATIONI SACERDOTUM ADORATORUM."

BEATISSIME PATER:

Episcopus Covingtonensis, ad genua Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus, exponit quod ipse a tredecim annis est in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis protector *Associationis Sacerdotum Adoratorum* quae cum approbatione Sanctae Sedis per totum orbem diffusa est et quam in praedictos Status Foederatos invexit.

Et supplex implorat ut sacerdotes ex quacumque regione qui nomen dederint praedictae Associationi possint benedicendo Coronas eis annectere Indulgentias Crucigerorum vulgo dictas.

Juxta preces ex animo; et dilectis filiis Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Die 29 Mense Maio An. 1907. PIUS PP. X.

Concordat cum originali. Roma, die 30 Maii 1907.

CAMILLUS PAULUS, Episc. Covington.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

PROGRAMMA GENERALE STUDIORUM A PIO X PP. APPROBATUM PRO OMNIBUS SEMINARIIS ITALIAE.

Illustre e Molto Rev. Monsignore come Fratello,

La S. Congregazione dei VV. e RR. avendo avuto dal S. Padre l'incarico di riordinare i Seminari d'Italia, oltre ad aver presi a tal fine speciali provvedimenti, ha creduto opportuno di proporre un Programma generale di studi per uniformare e migliorare l'insegnamento nei Seminari medesimi.

Nell'elaborare il Programma si è preso a base dell'ordinamento degli studi la divisione dei corsi che è stata ormai introdotta in quasi tutti i Seminari, cioè in Ginnasio, Liceo, Teologia.

Per le materie d'insegnamento nel Ginnasio e nel Liceo e per la loro distribuzione, si è ritenuto doversi seguire, con le necessarie modificazioni, i programmi vigenti in Italia; e ciò non perchè siano perfetti, ma principalmente per le seguente ragioni:

1° I programmi in vigore rappresentano innanzi alla società lo sviluppo della cultura che oggi si richiede, onde l'opinione pubblica circonda naturalmente di maggiore stima coloro che vengono istruiti secondo i medesimi; e il rifiutarli sarebbe mettere il clero, almeno secondo il giudizio di molti, al disotto dei secolari.

2° E da considerare inoltre che i nostri alunni non possono, in via ordinaria, decidersi seriamente sulla loro vocazione allo stato ecclesiastico, se non quando sono giunti a una età più matura: sembra quindi utile di ordinare gli studi in modo che gli alunni possano trovarsi in grado di fornirsi de' titoli legali, e con ciò esser più liberi nella scelta dello stato. Senza dire poi, che detti titoli, anzichè nuocere, saranno giovevoli anche a quelli che Dio si degnerà di chiamare alla vita sacerdotale.

Una saggia e accorta direzione impedirà facilmente, o attenuerà di molto, gl' inconvenienti che potrebbero nascere dal caso di alunni che tentassero di rimanere in Seminario, dopo il Ginnasio, al solo scopo di conseguire la licenza liceale.

Finalmente il programma del Liceo non aggiunge alle materie che debbono far parte della Filosofia nei Seminari, se non la continuazione dello studio delle Lettere e della Storia, studio che è necessarissimo anche agli alunni del Santuario, per riuscire *instructi ad omne opus bonum.*

Si è stimato conveniente di premettere un anno di Propedeutica alla Teologia, sia per completare l'insegnamento della filosofia, sia per esporre alcune materie che non troverebbero facilmente luogo nel corso teologico; ma da questo anno si potrà ottenere la dispensa dalla S. C. dei VV. e RR. quando venga dimostrato che nel Liceo si è provveduto per una adeguata preparazione alla Teologia.

Per gli studi teologici sono determinate le materie necessarie a renderli completi, e che nondimeno possano comodamente svolgersi in quattro anni.

Tale è il Programma che, debitamente approvato della suprema autorità del S. Padre, mi pregio di rimettere alla S. V. con la preghiera di far sì che, nel prossimo anno scolastico, il medesimo entri pienamente in vigore per i corsi di studi stabiliti in codesto V. Seminario.

La S. V. è pregata ancora di riferire a questa S. C. circa l'ordinamento scolastico di codesto V. Seminario, come pure di trasmettere l'elenco degl'insegnanti e la lista dei libri di testo adottati.

Nutro ferma fiducia che, grazie alle cure diligenti della S. V., sarà assicurata l'esatta osservanza del Programma, la quale contribuirà efficacemente a perfezionare la cultura del clero, ponendolo in grado di compiere, con maggior frutto per le anime, la sua alta missione.

Augurandole dal Signore ogni bene, con riverente stima mi pregio di confermarmi.

Roma, 10 maggio 1907.

Come Fratello

D. Card. FERRATA, *Prefetto.*

F. GIUSTINI, *Segretario.*

Programma Generale di Studi.

I.—Divisione del Corso di Studi.

Il Corso di studi in tutti i Seminari d'Italia si divide in Ginnasio, Liceo e Teologia.

II.—Ginnasio.

a) Nessuno sarà ascritto alle classi ginnasiali se non presenti il certificato che ne dimostri l'idoneità, per aver compiuto regolarmente le classi precedenti, o non ne superi il relativo esame.

b) Il Ginnasio avrà un corso di cinque anni. diviso in cinque classi, nelle quali s'insegneranno le materie dei programmi vigenti, seguendone anche la distribuzione delle ore, in modo però che, da una parte, si dia una certa preferenza alla lingua latina in tutte le classi, e dall'altra, si mettano gli alunni in grado di prendere la licenza ginnasiale.

c) Si assegnerà almeno un'ora per settimana in ogni classe per l'istruzione catechistica.

III.—Liceo.

a) Nessuno sia ammesso al Liceo che non abbia regolarmente compiuto le classi ginnasiali, superandone gli esami.

b) Il Liceo sarà diviso in tre classi corrispondenti a tre anni di studio, le quali per le materie e per le ore d'insegnamento si adatteranno ai programmi vigenti; in modo che gli alunni possano prendere la licenza liceale, e d'altra parte si dia più ampio sviluppo alla sana filosofia.

c) Si dovrà assegnare almeno un'ora per settimana all' insegnamento della religione.

IV.—Anno preparatorio alla Teologia.

a) In questo corso, oltre a rendere più profonda la conoscenza della filosofia, si studieranno speciali materie, le quali potranno essere quelle indicate nell'esempio d'orario che si trova in calce di questo programma (Quadro *A.*).

b) Nei Seminari dove sarà stabilito questo speciale anno di Propedeutica, lo studio della filosofia nei tre anni di Liceo dovrà comprendere: psicologia, logica e metafisica generale, etica.

c) Dove si ottenesse dispensa da quest'anno, nei tre anni di Liceo, per i chierici aspiranti al sacerdozio, oltre le materie stabilite nei Programmi, si dovranno assegnare almeno due ore di più per settimana, fosse anche nel giovedi, per compire lo studio della filosofia, specialmente di quelle parti che sono necessarie per una adeguata preparazione agli studi teologici.

V.—Teologia.

a) La Teologia avrà un corso di quattro anni diviso in quattro classi, con un orario regolare di quattro ore d'insegnamento al giorno.

b) Esso comprenderà le materie seguenti: Luoghi teologici —Introduzione generale e speciale alla S. Scrittura—Esegesi biblica — Teologia dogmatica e sacramentaria — Teologia morale e pastorale—Istituzioni di diritto Canonico—Storia ecclesiastica—Lingua ebraica—Lingua greca—Archeologia ed Arte Sacra—S. Eloquenza e Patristica—S. Liturgia.

VI.—Disposizioni generali.

a) Perchè tale programma sia convenientemente eseguito, ogni Seminario abbia un Prefetto degli Studi, eletto dal Vescovo.

b) Al Prefetto spetterà, sempre sotto la dipendenza del Vescovo, la preparazione degli schemi per i professori, la compilazione del Calendario e degli Orari scolastici.

c) Egli—sentito anche il parere de' Professori, che dovrà chiamare a consiglio ogni mese e con più frequenza se lo giudicherà necessario — adatterà al bisogno e anche modificherà i programmi vigenti, distribuirà le ore d'insegnamento de' programmi medesimi, in modo che, salva la sostanza e la preparazione adeguata agli esami di licenza, si possa dare maggior tempo a materie di più grande importanza rispetto al fine de'Seminari, come si è già osservato per il latino nel Ginnasio e per la Filosofia nel Liceo.

d) L'anno scolastico durerà non meno di nove mesi.

e) Il Prefetto degli Studi, con il Consiglio de'Professori, disporrà che alla fine dell'anno si facciano regolari e severi esami di tutte le materie, per la promozione alle classi superiori, fissando il voto necessario per ottenere la idoneità.

f) Sarà stabilita una sessione per gli esami di riparazione.

g) Le singole materie negli studi liceali e teologici saranno affidate a distinti Professori, i quali potranno, in via eccezionale, essere incaricati dell'insegnamento di qualche materia affine. Si dovrà sempre però evitare ad ogni costo l'inconveniente che una stessa persona abbia troppe ore d'insegnamento, con danno evidente degli alunni.

h) Nello svolgimento della propria materia, ciascun Professore adotterà untesto, che spiegherà in modo da poter esaurire dentro l'anno, proporzionatamente e per intero, il programma.

i) Per il Ginnasio ed il Liceo, dovendo seguirsi i programmi vigenti, i libri di testo saranno scelti a norma dei programmi medesimi, avuto naturalmente riguardo all'indole e allo scopo dei Seminari.

k) Per la Filosofia e la Teologia il testo sarà proposto dal Consiglio dei Professori, e sottomesso all'approvazione del Vescovo.

NOTA.—Nei Seminari centrali e interdiocesani, i diritti dell' Ordinario spettano al Collegio dei Vescovi cointeressati.

Vidimus et adprobavimus, Venerabilibus fratribus Episcopis fidelem observantiam enixe commendantes.

Die v Maii, festo S. Pii V, anno MCMVII.

PIVS PP. X.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

ACTUS HEROICUS AD LIBITUM REVOCARI POTEST.

Ad hanc S. Congregationem Indulgentiarum transmissum est a S. C. Christiano Nomini propagando praeposita sequens dubium, cuius solutionem R.mus Episcopus Chicoutimiensis postulavit, nempe:

An fidelis emittens *actum heroicum*, quod *votum* ordinarie vocatur, quo in suffragium defunctorum, divinae Maiestati offert omnes indulgentias, quas vivens lucrari potest, nec non omnia sua opera satisfactoria, et etiam suffragia sibimet post mortem conferenda, possit, quando ipsi libuerit, revocare?

Et S. C. proposito dubio respondendum mandavit:
Affirmative.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis, die 20 Februarii 1907.

C. Card. CRETONI, *Praef.*

L. * S.

Pro R. P. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laod., Secret.*
JOSEPHUS M. Can. COSELLI, *Substit.*

II.

SODALES SOCIETATIS SS. ROSARII INDULGENTIAS LUCRARI POTERUNT ETIAMSI SINGULAS DECADAS AD LIBITUM SEPARENT.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X in Audientia mihi infrascripto concessa, die 13 Octobris 1906, benigne concessit ut Sodales Societatis Rosarii quascumque Indulgentias recitationi adnexas lucrari valeant etiam singulas decadas ad libitum separando, non solum quando agitur de illo Rosario infra hebdomadam recitando cui Sodales tenentur, sed de aliis Rosariis intra quemcumque diem ultronea devotione recitatis.

In quorum fidem, etc.

Romae, 14 Octobris, 1906.

L. * S.

Fr. HYACINTHUS M. CORMIER, *M. G. O. P.*

III.

INDULG. 50 D. CONCEDITUR ALUMNIS RELIGIOSARUM FAMILIARUM QUOTIES QUAMDAM IACULAT. PRECEM RECITANT, CUM INTENTIONE DENUO RELIGIOSA VOTA NUNCUPANDI.

Beatissime Pater, Frater Maria Henricus Desqueyrous Procurator Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus, humiliter exponit, quod in diversis utriusque sexus communitatibus, ad saepius renovandam professionis religiosae memoriam, habitualis facta est illa ad sacratissimum Cor Iesu devota invocatio: *Cor Iesu, charitatis victima, fac me Tibi hostiam viventem, sanctam, Deo placentem.*

Instanter exinde supplicat humilis orator, ut Sanctitas Vestra huic invocationi aliquam indulgentiam concedere digne-

tur, toties lucrandam, quoties recitabitur cum intentione religiosam professionem renovandi.

Et Deus, etc.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X, in audientia habita die 27 Februarii 1907 ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae omnibus utriusque sexus Religiosarum familiarum alumnis et alumnabus, vota emittentibus, benigne concessit Indulgentiam quinquaginta dierum toties lucrandam, quoties ipsi vel ipsae, cum intentione denuo religiosa vota nuncupandi, praefatam iaculatoriam precem corde saltem contrito ac devote recitaverint. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, e Secretaria eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis, die 27 Februarii 1907.

S. Card. CRETONI, *Praef.*

L. * S.

✠ D. PANICI, Archiep. Laodicen., *Secret.*

E S. R. ET UNIV. INQUISITIONE.

I.

TOLERATUR IN CASU UT PUELLAE SCHISMATICAE CANERE POSSINT UNA CUM CATHOLICIS IN FUNCTIONIBUS ECCLESIASTICIS.

Beatissime Pater, Vicarius Apostolicus Sophiae et Philippopolis in Bulgaria, ad pedes Sanctitatis Tuae provolutus, humillime exponit quae sequuntur:

Sophiae Sorores quaedam religiosae Institutum puellarum (*Pensionnat*) dirigunt, in quo cum catholicis etiam schismaticae admittuntur. Mos invaluit ut in functionibus ecclesiasticis ac praesertim in expositione ac benedictione cum Sanctissimo, uti etiam ante et post illam, puellae schismaticae una cum catholicis in Ecclesia parochiali canant. Unde petit orator an hic usus tolerari possit, habitis sub oculis sequentibus animadversionibus:

1. Agitur de loco in quo numerus catholicorum, relate ad schismaticos est valde exiguus.

2. Nullum adest periculum scandali, namque idem usus servatur in fere omnibus Orientis regionibus.

3. Adest contra spes conversionis acatholicorum.

4. Durum esset Sororibus, quae Institutum dirigunt, puellis schismaticis sponte ac lubenter in Ecclesia cum catholicis cantantibus silentium imponere.

5. Denique eaedem puellae schismaticae, utpote bona fide in schismate viventes, non videntur uti excommunicatae esse habendae.

Feria IV, die 24 Ianuarii 1906.

E.mi Patres, attentis peculiaribus circumstantiis in casu concurrentibus, respondendum mandarunt: Prout exponitur a Vicario Apostolico Sophiae et Philippopolis, tolerari posse.

In sequenti vero feria V eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita audientia R. P. D. Adsessori S. O. impertita, facta de his SS.mo D. N. Pio PP. X relatione, Sanctitas Sua resolutionem E.morum Patrum adprobavit et confirmavit. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

PETRUS PALOMBELLI, *S. R. et U. I. Secret.*

II.

SYLLABUS PROPOSITIONUM REPROBATARUM.

DECRETUM.

Feria IV, die 3 Iulii 1907

Lamentabili sane exitu aetas nostra freni impatiens in rerum summis rationibus indagandis ita nova non raro sequitur ut, dimissa humani generis quasi haereditate, in errores incidat gravissimos. Qui errores longe erunt perniciosiores, si de disciplinis agitur sacris, si de Sacra Scriptura interpretanda, si de fidei praecipuis mysteriis. Dolendum autem vehementer inveniri etiam inter catholicos non ita paucos scriptores qui, praetergressi fines a patribus ac ab ipsa Sancta Ecclesia statutos, altioris intelligentiae specie et historicae considerationis nomine, eum dogmatum progressum quaerunt qui, reipsa, eorum corruptela est.

Ne vero huius generis errores, qui quotidie inter fideles spar-

guntur, in eorum animis radices figant ac fidei sinceritatem corrumpant, placuit SSmo D. N. Pio divina providentia Pp. X ut per hoc Sacrae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis officium ii qui inter eos praecipui essent, notarentur et reprobarentur.

Quare, instituto diligentissimo examine, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, Emi ac Rmi Dñi Cardinales, in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitores Generales, propositiones quae sequuntur reprobandas ac proscribendas esse iudicarunt, prouti hoc generali Decreto reprobantur ac proscribuntur:

1. Ecclesiastica lex quae praescribit subiicere praeviae censurae libros Divinas respicientes Scripturas, ad cultores critices aut exegeseos scientificae librorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti non extenditur.

2. Ecclesiae interpretatio Sacrorum Librorum non est quidem spernenda, subiacet tamen accuratiori exegetarum iudicio et correctioni.

3. Ex iudiciis et censuris ecclesiasticis contra liberam et cultiorem exegesim latis colligi potest fidem ab Ecclesia propositam contradicere historiae, et dogmata catholica cum verioribus christianae religionis originibus componi reipsa non posse.

4. Magisterium Ecclesiae ne per dogmaticas quidem definitiones genuinum Sacrarum Scripturarum sensum determinare potest.

5. Quum in deposito fidei veritates tantum revelatae contineantur, nullo sub respectu ad Ecclesiam pertinet iudicium ferre de assertionibus disciplinarum humanarum.

6. In definiendis veritatibus ita collaborant discens et docens Ecclesia, ut docenti Ecclesiae nihil supersit nisi communes discentis opinationes sancire.

7. Ecclesia, cum proscribit errores, nequit a fidelibus exigere ullum internum assensum, quo iudicia a se edita complectantur.

8. Ab omni culpa immunes existimandi sunt qui reprobationes a Sacra Congregatione Indicis aliisve Sacris Romanis Congregationibus latas nihili pendunt.

9. Nimiam simplicitatem aut ignorantiam prae se ferunt qui Deum credunt vere esse Scripturae Sacrae auctorem.

10. Inspiratio librorum Veteris Testamenti in eo constitit quod scriptores israelitae religiosas doctrinas sub peculiari quodam aspectu, gentibus parum noto aut ignoto, tradiderunt.

11. Inspiratio divina non ita ad totam Scripturam Sacram extenditur, ut omnes et singulas eius partes ab omni errore praemuniat.

12. Exegeta, si velit utiliter studiis biblicis incumbere, in primis quamlibet praeconceptam opinionem de supernaturali origine Scripturae Sacrae seponere debet, eamque non aliter interpretari quam cetera documenta mere humana.

13. Parabolas evangelicas ipsimet Evangelistate ac christiani secundae et tertiae generationis artificiose digesserunt, atque ita rationem dederunt exigui fructus praedicationis Christi apud iudaeos.

14. In pluribus narrationibus non tam quae vera sunt Evangelistae retulerunt, quam quae lectoribus, etsi falsa, censuerunt magis proficua.

15. Evangelia usque ad definitum constitutumque canonem continuis additionibus et correctionibus aucta fuerunt; in ipsis proinde doctrinae Christi non remansit nisi tenue et incertum vestigium.

16. Narrationes Ioannis non sunt proprie historia, sed mystica Evangelii contemplatio; sermones, in eius evangelio contenti, sunt meditationes theologicae circa mysterium salutis historica veritate destitutae.

17. Quartum Evangelium miracula exaggeravit non tantum ut extraordinaria magis apparerent, sed etiam ut aptiora fierent ad significandum opus et gloriam Verbi Incarnati.

18. Ioannes sibi vindicat quidem rationem testis de Christo; re tamen vera non est nisi eximius testis vitae christianae, seu vitae Christi in Ecclesia, exeunte primo saeculo.

19. Heterodoxi exegetae fidelius expresserunt sensum verum Scripturarum quam exegetae catholici.

20. Revelatio nihil aliud esse potuit quam acquisita ab homine suae ad Deum relationis conscientia.

21. Revelatio, obiectum fidei catholicae constituens, non fuit cum Apostolis completa.

22. Dogmata quae Ecclesia perhibet tamquam revelata, non sunt veritates e coelo delapsae, sed sunt interpretatio quaedam factorum religiosorum quam humana mens laborioso conatu sibi comparavit.

23. Existere potest et reipsa existit oppositio inter facta quae in Sacra Scriptura narrantur eisque innixa Ecclesiae dogmata; ita ut criticus tamquam falsa reiicere possit facta quae Ecclesia tamquam certissima credit.

24. Reprobandus non est exegeta qui praemissas adstruit, ex quibus sequitur dogmata historice falsa aut dubia esse, dummodo dogmata ipsa directe non neget.

25. Assensus fidei ultimo innititur in congerie probabilitatum.

26. Dogmata fidei retinenda sunt tantummodo iuxta sensum practicum, idest tanquam norma praeceptiva agendi, non vero tanquam norma credendi.

27. Divinitas Iesu Christi ex Evangeliis non probatur; sed est dogma quod conscientia christiana e notione Messiae deduxit.

28. Iesus, quum ministerium suum exercebat, non in eum finem loquebatur ut doceret se esse Messiam, neque eius miracula eo spectabant ut id demonstraret.

29. Concedere licet Christum quem exhibet historia, multo inferiorem esse Christo qui est obiectum fidei.

30. In omnibus textibus evangelicis nomen *Filius Dei* aequivalet tantum nomini *Messias,* minime vero significat Christum esse verum et naturalem Dei Filium.

31. Doctrina de Christo quam tradunt Paulus, Ioannes et Concilia Nicaenum, Ephesinum, Chalcedonense, non est ea quam Iesus docuit, sed quam de Iesu concepit conscientia christiana.

32. Conciliari nequit sensus naturalis textuum evangelicorum cum eo quod nostri theologi docent de conscientia et scientia infallibili Iesu Christi.

33. Evidens est cuique qui praeconceptis non ducitur opinionibus, Iesum aut errorem de proximo messianico adventu fuisse professum, aut maiorem partem ipsius doctrinae in Evangeliis Synopticis contentae authenticitate carere.

34. Criticus nequit asserere Christo scientiam nullo circumscriptam limite nisi facta hypothesi, quae historice haud concipi potest quaeque sensui morali repugnat, nempe Christum uti hominem habuisse scientiam Dei et nihilominus noluisse notitiam tot rerum communicare cum discipulis ac posteritate.

35. Christus non semper habuit conscientiam suae dignitatis messianicae.

36. Resurrectio Salvatoris non est proprie factum ordinis historici, sed factum ordinis mere supernaturalis, nec demonstratum nec demonstrabile, quod conscientia christiana sensim ex aliis derivavit.

37. Fides in resurrectionem Christi ab initio fuit non tam de facto ipso resurrectionis, quam de vita Christi immortali apud Deum.

38. Doctrina de morte piaculari Christi non est evangelica sed tantum paulina.

39. Opiniones de origine sacramentorum, quibus Patres Tridentini imbuti erant quaeque in eorum canones dogmaticos procul dubio influxum habuerunt, longe distant ab iis quae nunc penes historicos rei christianae indagatores merito obtinent.

40. Sacramenta ortum habuerunt ex eo quod Apostoli eorumque successores ideam aliquam et intentionem Christi, suadentibus et moventibus circumstantiis et eventibus, interpretati sunt.

41. Sacramenta eo tantum spectant ut in mentem hominis revocent praesentiam Creatoris semper beneficam.

42. Communitas christiana necessitatem baptismi induxit, adoptans illum tamquam ritum necessarium, eique professionis christianae obligationes adnectens.

43. Usus conferendi baptismum infantibus evolutio fuit disciplinaris, quae una ex causis extitit ut sacramentum resolveretur in duo, in baptismum scilicet et poenitentiam.

44. Nihil probat ritum sacramenti confirmationis usurpatum fuisse ab Apostolis: formalis autem distinctio duorum sacramentorum, baptismi scilicet et confirmationis, haud spectat ad historiam christianismi primitivi.

45. Non omnia, quae narrat Paulus de institutione Eucharistiae (I. Cor. xi, 23-25), historice sunt sumenda.

46. Non adfuit in primitiva Ecclesia conceptus de christiano peccatore auctoritate Ecclesiae reconciliato, sed Ecclesia nonnisi admodum lente huiusmodi conceptui assuevit. Imo etiam postquam poenitentia tanquam Ecclesiae institutio agnita fuit, non appellabatur sacramenti nomine, eo quod haberetur uti sacramentum probrosum.

47. Verba Domini: *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis, et quorum retinueritis, retenta sunt* (Io. xx. 22 et 23) minime referuntur ad sacramentum poenitentiae, quidquid Patribus Tridentinis asserere placuit.

48. Iacobus in sua epistola (vv. 14 et 15) non intendit promulgare aliquod sacramentum Christi, sed commendare pium aliquem morem, et si in hoc more forte cernit medium aliquod gratiae, id non accipit eo rigore, quo acceperunt theologi qui notionem et numerum sacramentorum statuerunt.

49. Coena christiana paullatim indolem actionis liturgicae assumente, hi, qui Coenae praeesse consueverant, characterem sacerdotalem acquisiverunt.

50. Seniores qui in christianorum coetibus invigilandi munere fungebantur, instituti sunt ab Apostolis presbyteri aut episcopi ad providendum necessariae crescentium communitatum ordinationi, non proprie ad perpetuandam missionem et potestatem Apostolicam.

51. Matrimonium non potuit evadere sacramentum novae legis nisi serius in Ecclesia; siquidem ut matrimonium pro sacramento haberetur necesse erat ut praecederet plena doctrinae de gratia et sacramentis theologica explicatio.

52. Alienum fuit a mente Christi Ecclesiam constituere veluti societatem super terram per longam saeculorum seriem duraturam; quin imo in mente Christi regnum coeli una cum fine mundi iamiam adventurum erat.

53. Constitutio organica Ecclesiae non est immutabilis; sed societas christiana perpetuae evolutioni aeque ac societas humana est obnoxia.

54. Dogmata, sacramenta, hierarchia, tum quod ad notionem tum quod ad realitatem attinet, non sunt nisi intelligentiae christianae interpretationes evolutionesque quae exiguum germen in Evangelio latens externis incrementis auxerunt perfeceruntque.

55. Simon Petrus ne suspicatus quidem unquam est sibi a Christo demandatum esse primatum in Ecclesia.

56. Ecclesia Romana non ex divinae providentiae ordinatione, sed ex mere politicis conditionibus caput omnium Ecclesiarum effecta est.

57. Ecclesia sese praebet scientiarum naturalium et theologicarum progressibus infensam.

58. Veritas non est immutabilis plusquam ipse homo, quippe quae cum ipso, in ipso et per ipsum evolvitur.

59. Christus determinatum doctrinae corpus omnibus temporibus cunctisque hominibus applicabile non docuit, sed potius inchoavit motum quemdam religiosum diversis temporibus ac locis adaptatum vel adaptandum.

60. Doctrina christiana in suis exordiis fuit iudaica, sed facta est per successivas evolutiones primum paulina, tum ioannica, demum hellenica et universalis.

61. Dici potest absque paradoxo nullum Scripturae caput, a primo Genesis ad postremum Apocalypsis, continere doctrinam prorsus identicam illi quam super eadem re tradit Ecclesia, et idcirco nullum Scripturae caput habere eumdem sensum pro critico ac pro theologo.

62. Praecipui articuli Symboli Apostolici non eamdem pro christianis primorum temporum significationem habebant quam habent pro christianis nostri temporis.

63. Ecclesia sese praebet imparem ethicae evangelicae efficaciter tuendae, quia obstinate adhaeret immutabilibus doctrinis quae cum hodiernis progressibus componi nequeunt.

64. Progressus scientiarum postulat ut reformentur conceptus doctrinae christianae de Deo, de Creatione, de Revelatione, de Persona Verbi Incarnati, de Revelatione, de Persona Verbi Incarnati, de Redemptione.

65. Catholicismus hodiernus cum vera scientia componi

nequit nisi transformetur in quemdam christianismum non dogmaticum, id est in protestantismum latum et liberalem.

Sequenti vero feria V die 4 eiusdem mensis et anni, facta de his omnibus SS.mo D. N. Pio Pp. X accurata relatione, Sanctitas Sua Decretum Emorum Patrum adprobavit et confirmavit, ac omnes et singulas supra recensitas propositiones ceu reprobatas ac proscriptas ab omnibus haberi mandavit.

PETRUS PALOMBELLI,
S. R. U. I. Notarius.

E SECRETARIA BREVIUM.

BREVE COMMEMORATIONUM JUBILAEI QUINQUAGINTA ANNORUM AB ERECTIONE COLLEGII AMERICANI (LOVANII).

Pius PP. X.

Ad Futuram Rei Memoriam.

In hac Beati Petri Principis Apostolorum Cathedra, nullis quidem meritis Nostris, divinitus collocati, ad pia potissimum instituta, in quibus adolescentes in Ecclesiae spem succrescentes, liberalibus disciplinis simul ac religiosa pietate imbuuntur, paterno ac vigili studio oculos mentis Nostrae convertimus; et quae ceteris praestare noscamus, tum alumnorum frequentia ac diligentia, cum assidua bonorum operum exercitatione, ea debito laudum praeconio libenti quidem gratoque animo prosequi satagimus. Frugifera haec inter instituta pluribus nominibus optime de re sacra merita, jure meritoque accensendum est Conlegium Americanum Lovanii in Belgio anno MDCCCLVII erectum, ad finem excipiendi e variis Europae nationibus juvenes, illosque ita erudiendi, ut inde novi ad Foederatos Americae Septentrionalis Status, divini verbi praecones solvant. Conlegium enim illud maxima brevi favente Deo incrementa habuit. Et sane ab eodem plus quam quingenti prodierunt missionarii, qui religionis provehendae studio flagrantes, neque laboribus fracti, neque adversis rebus defatigati, sed ad pretiosam usque in conspectu Domini sanguinis effusionem pro Christi fide parati, uberrimos in Dominico agro excolendo fructus perceperunt. In omnes vel

longo terrarum spatio dissitas Foederatorum Statuum Americae Septentrionalis regiones, exivit sonus eorum, auctaque feliciter in illis partibus Christi re, Missionariorum eorundem actuosi zeli, ac germanae fidei, necnon immutati erga Romanam Cathedram obsequii miranda ibidem testimonia suppetunt. Nunc autem cum hoc anno quinquagesimus sese vertat a primaeva Conlegii ipsius erectione, placet Nobis votis annuere Antistitis Covingtoniensis Praesidis Commissionis Episcoporum Americanorum memorati Conlegii regimini praepositae, atque auspicatissima eadem occasione propensae Nostrae voluntatis sensus significare. Etenim hac tempestate, qua tot tantaque mala videt lugetque christianus orbis, gratum Nobis est, exantlatos pro vera fide propaganda labores celebrare, ut alii ad imitationem excitentur, atque egregia Missionariorum facinora studeant aemulari, ne quid Catholicum nomen detrimenti capiat, sed disjectis hostium molitionibus, novo Christi Redemptoris religio splendore renideat. Itaque hortamur ipsius Conlegii doctores et alumnos, ut stent in fide constantes, numquam a proposito sibi fine deflectant, sed majorum vestigiis insistentes, omni ope studeant, ut Americae Septentrionalis regiones Evangelicis praeconibus abundent. Propterea precamur bonorum omnium auctorem Deum, ut ipsum Conlegium fortunet propitius, ut illius moderatores, doctores, alumnos et benefactores, peculiaribus misericordiae suae gratiis complectatur; atque interim coelestium munerum auspicem, Nostraeque benevolentiae testimonium, Americani praefati Conlegii moderatoribus, doctoribus, alumnis et benefactoribus quos recensuimus, Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimur. Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die xix Julii MDCCCCVII.

Pontificatus Nostri Anno Quarto.

R. *Card.* MERRY DEL VAL,
A Secretis Status.

Locus * Sigilli.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

PONTIFICAL ACT: The Holy Father, at the request of the Bishop of Covington, grants the faculty of blessing the Crozier Beads to priests duly enrolled as members of the *Priests' Eucharistic League.*

S. CONGREGATION OF BISHOPS AND REGULARS publishes the program of studies to be adopted in the Italian ecclesiastical seminaries. The preparatory studies to Theology correspond with the requirements of the secular or public courses of instruction in the Latin and High Schools authorized by the government. The schema is accompanied by a letter of the Cardinal Prefect of the S. Congregation enjoining the definite observance of the program upon all Ordinaries in Italy, beginning with the opening of the next scholastic year.

S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES:

1. Decides that persons having made the so-called *Heroic Act*, which has the form of a vow, may revoke the same at their discretion.

2. Grants to members of the Rosary Confraternity the privilege of interrupting the recitation of the beads without forfeiting the indulgences hitherto attached to each bead only when the five decades were completed.

3. Grants to religious an indulgence of fifty days as often as they recite the invocation: "Heart of Jesus, Victim of charity, make of me an oblation, living, holy, pleasing to God," if they have at the same time the intention of renewing their religious profession.

S. CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE permits the practice of certain Bulgarian convents to assemble their pupils, many of whom are schismatics, at divine service in chapel where all join in the sacred chants, so long as there is no danger of scandal or perversion in such practice.

NEW SYLLABUS OF ERRORS contains text of sixty-five condemned propositions prepared by the Congr. of the Inquisition and approved by Pius X.

SECRETARIATE OF BRIEFS congratulates the American College at Louvain on the occasion of its Golden Jubilee. (See page 328.)

A READER OF "SIXES AND SEVENS."

EDITOR, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

It might interest the readers of the article "Sixes and Sevens" to hear what a novice in the study of Church Music has to say in reply to the difficult (?) question as to whether or no the Church music compositions of Gounod and Beethhoven may be termed "holy" music, *i. e.*, true Church music, and what he thinks of the reply given to "Perplexed" on page 196 in the August number of the REVIEW.

I claim that it is not difficult at all to decide whether or no the Church music compositions of Gounod and Beethhoven may be termed "holy" music, provided the judge in the case is acquainted with the *Motu proprio* regulations, in which the Holy Father says expressly: "For these reasons the Gregorian plainsong was always considered as the highest model for sacred music, and thus the following general law can be enunciated—a church composition is so much more sacred and liturgical as it the more nearly approaches Gregorian melody in its form, its inspiration, and its style; and it is so much the less worthy of the temple the more it deviates from this highest model."

Such qualities we find in the Palestrina style of music and in many compositions of the Cecilian School (I say many Cecilians, not all—for many Cecilians have composed Church music which is not worldly and incorrect according to the laws of harmony, though lacking in artistic value). As to Gounod and Beethhoven, I dare say it is not difficult at all to notice that the qualities essential to good Church music are lacking in their compositions. For instance, just glance at the Gloria in Gounod's "Paschal Mass," and if you are acquainted with Gounod's "Faust" you will easily notice that Gounod's Gloria recalls strongly the music in his "Faust." Hence he makes no difference in his style whether he writes for the stage or for the church.

Concerning the Church music compositions of Mozart, Gounod, Beethhoven, etc., I dare say their compositions are of artistic value as to the music, but their compositions are not suitable for the house of God because (1) of their form (length, superfluous repetitions, duets, omissions, or change of words), and (2) of their style of music (words suited to music, whereas in plain chant it is *vice versa*—music suited to words; and the compositions are also worldly and theatrical in style).

I therefore claim: Mozart, Gounod, Beethhoven, and the like, are artists as to the music they composed: it is good music, but their compositions are not true Church music, because of the form and style of their compositions.

In the April number (page 196) "Perplexed" receives a very good answer in "What Am I to Do?" I am sure the answer will help the reform movement a great deal. The REVIEW might have mentioned in its answer that men like Mozart, Halevy, Berlioz, Spohr, Clemens Brentano, Thibaut, Kade, and others—all able musicians and composers — considered the Gregorian Chants good and true church melodies, and the above are deemed authorities on this point. It is evident that organists who are either not well up in the Chant of the Church or are afraid of the hard work connected with a correct rendition of the Chant, will try hard to make the impression that the Gregorian Chant is hard and doleful music for feast days.

Give every church four to eight men, ten boys and a *good organist* and all our churches will soon condemn the theatrical style of Church music we hear from so many choir-lofts in this country, and I dare say sooner or later we would have Church music that will not detract but edify, and we will even *prefer* to hear a boy's voice to that of a woman's (for Church music). I am sure if your correspondent had heard a good rendition of true Church music he would have put his question, "Where can I find a good and willing organist for Church music?" It is a mistake to let laymen tell us what true Church music is. If we will reform, we must do what Dr. Witt did who succeeded in reforming Germany during the last century — that is, give the diocese a "visiting" or "traveling" choir, thereby enabling the faithful to hear a correct rendition of true Church music, and many good pastors will say, "We have been one hundred years behind the age." Would that every diocese had a Commission

and a traveling or visiting choir. Then we would all pray more devoutly and our churches would not stand for the poor Church music that still is heard in many church choirs.

"QUEM NOSTI."

THE PROPOSED MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

EDITOR, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

The proposition made by Father Currier in the July issue, to establish one great missionary society to do all the collecting for missionary purposes in this country, and thus do away with the many appeals that go out for various purposes, is open to many objections, and particularly at this present time.

First of all, it is not new. It was presented at the Missionary Conference held at the Apostolic Mission House, Washington, where were assembled the representatives of the different missionary efforts, and after a good deal of discussion it was deemed inadvisable. Among the many reasons for this conclusion is the fact that, in the commencement era of missionary development, every stimulant to giving for missionary purposes is necessary in order to get anything like adequate support for existing endeavor, and there is no stimulant that is equal to personal effort. The time may come when the missionary spirit will be thoroughly aroused: and it will be necessary only to say the word, and money in any quantity will be forthcoming. When this ideal time does come, then each parish priest can set aside each year say a tenth of his revenue for outside missionary work, and a general organization such as suggested may in its best wisdom distribute share and share alike to each particular effort the means for carrying on its work. But we are far from that stage just now. The people have not been accustomed to give for any save parish needs. Some of the more generous, who are broad-gauged in their sympathies, have risen above the limits of parish life and have felt the life-throbs of a wider Catholicity. They belong to the Church Universal and have at heart its highest interests. They know that parish activities can be best stimulated by helping the whole Church, so they break away from parish limitations and have a heart big enough for the whole Church.

The majority of the people, however, see little Church activity beyond the limits of their parish. They must be taught that,

while their duty begins at home, it should not stay there. To cultivate a missionary spirit it is necessary that a great deal of personal effort be injected into the work of collecting. Father Currier must get out on the road and appeal with his persuasive eloquence to the crowded churches. So, too, must the Church Extension Society send its secretaries abroad. I know if I sat down and waited for the support of the Apostolic Mission House to come to me we would soon close our doors.

It is a plain fact that in the present state of the Church the missionary spirit must be aroused, missionary giving must be stimulated, and missionary ideals must be kept perpetually before the people. This can only be done by an effort in which one has a personal interest.

Then, again, in my judgment the missionary "Trust" that Father Currier advocates, instead of helping special efforts, will strangle them. Under its overshadowing paternalism individual efforts will wither away and, after these have been killed off, the "Trust" itself will die a natural death, and thus lead to the paralysis of all missionary endeavors. The popular sentiment condemns the trust, and justly so. It destroys competition. It is a conspiracy in restraint of trade. It dries up the springs of energetic life. It is fatal to the life of any endeavor. If it enters the missionary field, it will be just as blighting in its results as in the field of trade.

In this country we have not begun to get a sum for missionary work in any sense commensurate with the growing wealth of the Catholic people. The bleeding Church of France gives many times the amount that the American Catholics give; and as for the giving of Protestant Churches, why we are not to be mentioned in the same category. The reasons for the meagre giving of Catholics in the United States are: first, their attention has not been called to the need; secondly, the missionary spirit has not been adequately aroused.

What will arouse the missionary spirit and at the same time call the attention of Catholics to the needs of the Missions, is not the missionary "Trust," but the personal effort of those who are behind great missionary work.

A. P. DOYLE,
Rector of the Apostolic Mission House.
Washington, D. C.

COMMUNION WHEN THERE ARE NO SMALL HOSTS.

Qu. Through some error the key of the tabernacle had been taken from its customary place, and could not be found at the time when two or three persons were about approaching the altar-rail to communicate. Could the celebrant in such case consume half of the Sacred Host used in the Mass and divide the other half among the communicants at the rail? I assume that these persons have no other chance of receiving Communion that day.

Is it allowable at any time to divide the large Host of the Mass, after it is consecrated, into different parts? SACERDOS.

Resp. The rubrics of the Missal, speaking of accidents (De defectibus circa Missam occurrentibus, X, 3) occurring in the Mass, permit the division of the Sacred Host in the case of the celebrant being overtaken by illness after the Consecration. Under these circumstances another priest completes the Sacrifice by taking Holy Communion, and at the same time communicating the sick celebrant with the same Host, provided there are no other consecrated particles at hand. "Sacerdos qui missam supplet, dividat Hostiam et unam partem praebet infirmo, aliam ipse sumat."

This case, however, is an extreme one in which there is grave reason for communicating the sick priest, both because he is unable to complete the Sacrifice in any other way, and because he is in need of the spiritual food which Holy Communion is intended to supply. Cavalieri thinks that this would not apply to lay persons, who should be communicated only in the customary form or not at all, and he cites a decree of the S. Congregation of the Council, 12 February, 1679, to cover the case. (Cf. De Amicis, *Ceremoniale*, Vol. I, n. 176; 4.) Stimart (*Sacr. Liturg. Compend.*, n.445, nota 2) is of the same opinion, which he quotes as the "sententia communior," to the effect that "licitum non esse particulam majoris Hostiae Sacrificii laico praebere quia alia non est in promptu; hoc enim solummodo conceditur sacerdoti graviter infra suam missam subito aegrotanti, quando alius sacerdos missam absolvit, et alia non habetur Hostia celebranti infirmo praebenda."

The guardianship of the tabernacle is of such importance that the Church neither assumes nor legislates for accidents, which are to be rendered impossible by the care of the parish priest. When they occur, however, the consequences are to be borne as inseparable from them, and the communicants, though they incur a privation for which they are in no way accountable, suffer in the same way as if a priest had through forgetfulness broken his fast and found himself unable to celebrate for those who expected to receive Communion.

PONTIFICAL DECORATIONS.

Qu. The present Pope, although much insisting on the spiritual reforms called for in the Church, appears to be exceedingly lavish in his bestowal of honors of a purely temporal character. Such I take to be the multiplication of "monsignori," "doctors" (honorary), "marquises" and "counts" and "knights," which have no significance in the spiritual order, and bestow no official authority, aside from the supposed honor they confer, and are in many cases disregarded by the secular world, at least outside of Rome. On what plea can we defend these "honors" in a republican community the spirit of which is entirely against their bestowal, so much so that our ambassadors are not permitted, I understand, to accept them even as a reward for actual service. Our President is a man who is recognized as having done real service to the nations, yet we never see him decked out in the "starboard" fashion which foreign potentates, from the semi-barbarian to the most civilized, affect for themselves and their dependents. The display, however, has some meaning for them. But to see a Monsignor Montagnini affecting such jewelry on the cassock (itself a symbol of unworldliness condemning such vanities) which do not represent authority but merely secular honors, is revolting to our common-sense views of what religion means in its ministers.

Of course I understand the signification of the liturgical vesture and the distinction it gives to the *offices* of the sanctuary. But this distinction is not conveyed to the mind by the rank of monsignore which carries no special duties, no added authority to that which the exercise of the recipient's priestly office implies with or without the purple. Indeed, the purple, as it is worn by some of our ecclesiastics, who, good priests though they be,

often lack the sense of external dignity, renders the whole display at times ridiculous. No people despise the peacock style in men more than does the Yankee, unless it be the sturdy Englishman of the Eton type.

It might set me right if some time the REVIEW undertook to explain the philosophy of all this, for we need it sadly to dispel our prejudices.

Resp. The honor system of the Church, which of necessity has a temporal element in its administration (forming, so to speak, the preserving shell of the spiritual kernel which is its nourishing element) is much like that of any other external society. The purpose of bestowing honors may be: (1) reward for service; (2) maintenance of *esprit de corps*; (3) indication of actual authority. In the cases to which our correspondent mainly takes exception, that is to say, where the honor bestowed is neither a reward for service nor an indication of authoritative office, it serves to confirm the *esprit de corps,* or a certain loyalty to the cause or rule which the authority that grants the decoration represents. That this spirit of loyalty is of value to the Church's external regime, and that in some cases it is secured more easily on the grounds of natural rather than supernatural motives, are facts not undone by the humiliating truth of man's inborn tendency to vanity.

As to the general estimate set by the practical American mind upon such distinctions, we believe there is truth in the above criticism. Where undoubted merit and native dignity give worth to the possession of a title, the American, who as a rule disavows ancestral claims to virtue as capable of supplying his own lack of merit, will surely recognize it; but more often he silently ridicules it, for he has learnt to know how we make "colonels" and "majors" and "captains" who never carried a sword, and "doctors" who got their diplomas by paying for the parchment that proves the possession of the title without test.

But there is much to be said for the granting and the use of these honor titles. They have a historical origin and

therefore a meaning, which, if partly lost sight of in modern times, still retain a certain right of existence and in some cases do distinct good. We may return to the subject at another time.

THE APPOINTMENT OF IRREMOVABLE RECTORS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Qu. At the request of not a few clergymen whose interest in ascertaining the extent of the law is none other than academic, the undersigned was requested to respectfully submit for solution the following questions to the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

I. Is paragraph No. 35 of Caput V, Titulus II, of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore *mandatory* or *advisory?*

II. Assuming that every tenth parish in his diocese is honored with an irremovable rector, may the Ordinary, now that the required twenty years have elapsed since the enactment of the law, *increase* the number of irremovable rectors in his diocese beyond the proportion of one to ten?

III. Assuming that *one* in *ten* was the *minimum* required by the Council for the first twenty years and that the Ordinary now may (by implication, § 35), even *inconsulte*, exceed that number, what formalities are required for the validity of the act? Should the appointment be made in Synod (Diocesan) or *extra Synodum?* If it may be validly made *extra Synodum*, what formalities are required? RURICOLA.

Resp. The paragraph referred to under question I (Numb. 35, Cap. V, Tit. II, Third Plenary Council of Baltimore) is, in our opinion, not *advisory*, but *mandatory*. Chapter V treats of the appointment of irremovable rectors, and Number 35 is one of the *Decreta Concilii* regularly numbered and placed in the list of legislative enactments of the Council. Again, the wording of the Decree is mandatory in the usual imperative style of Church legislation: "Pro nunc instituantur in singulis dioecesibus rectores inamovibiles tali numero ..... dummodo conditiones requisitae adsint tum ex parte missionis, cum ex parte rectoris eligendi." This becomes clear by the limitation of time which is given for the execution of the decree: "Institutio autem rectorum inamovibilium, ut praescripta, ultra triennium a promulgatione concilii non

erit differenda." This is not the language of a legislator who intends his measure to be merely advisory. In the third place, the subject-matter of the decree gives us to understand that positive binding legislation is both intended and expressed. Thus the *Literae Apostolicae* appointing Archbishop (now Cardinal) Gibbons Apostolic Delegate for the Council, give as one of the reasons for holding the Council: "ad Dioecesium statum ita ordinandum, *ut propius ad commune Ecclesiae jus, quantum fieri possit, accedat.*"

This too was the intention of the Second Plenary Council, as we may read in N. 32 of the present Chapter V: "Hac de re Patres Concilii Plenarii Balt. II *statuerunt*: 'Quum olim jure optimo, ut ait Tridentinum Concilium, distinctae fuerint dioeceses et parochiae, etc. (Sess. 14, de Ref., c. 9.), optandum omnino esset ut juxta Ecclesiae universae consuetudinem parochi proprie dicti, quemadmodum in Catholicis regionibus existunt, in nostrarum quoque provinciarum ecclesiis constituerentur. Verum ea sunt nostra rerum tempora, quae id fieri nondum patiantur. *Patrum tamen mens est*, ut paulatim, et quatenus per adjuncta liceat, disciplina nostra hac in re Ecclesiae universae disciplinae conformetur. (C. Balt. II, 123.) Volumus igitur ut per omnes hasce provincias, praesertim majoribus in urbibus ubi plures sunt ecclesiae districtus quidam, paroeciae instar, descriptis accurate limitibus, unicuique ecclesiae assignetur; ejusque rectori jura parochialia vel quasi-parochialia tribuantur.'" (C. Balt. II, 124.) Thus far the Third Plenary Council quotes, and then in N. 33 continues: "Ex quo superius Concilium Plenarium celebratum fuit, nostrarum rerum status profecto non adeo est immutatus, ut ad literam servari possint omnia et singula quae sacris canonibus, et praesertim Concilii Tridentini decretis de instituendis paroeciis sapientissime provisa sunt. Verum ut disciplina nostra hac in re ad normam sanctionum canonicarum in tantum redigatur, in quantum locorum circumstantiae sinunt *haec statuenda censuimus.*" Then the Council proceeds to order the selection of certain missions as parish churches (*ut paroeciarum instar*), with irremovable rectors, this to be done "auctoritate Episcopi de consultorum suorum consilio." (Nn. 33 and 34.)

The Fathers of the Third Plenary Council evidently desired, according to the instructions of the Holy See, to make a decided move, as far as their circumstances would permit, in the direction of the general law of the Church regarding the establishment of parishes. We conclude therefore that the Council as a legislative body intended to bind its subjects, the bishops, to the execution of the legislation contained in Decr. N. 35.

To question II we answer that there appears to be no reason why, now that the twenty years' restriction has elapsed, a bishop may not increase the number of irremovable rectors in his diocese beyond the proportion of one to ten. The force of the twenty years' restriction having ceased by the lapse of the prescribed time, the bishop is left entirely free from such limitation, and may make the increase that the circumstances of his diocese permit. There is nothing in the law to prevent it.

It is to be noted here that the implication of the query, "inconsulte," is not admissible, because in the present matter the bishop is bound to act "praehabito consultorum suorum consilio" *pro prima vice* (N. 37), and in other cases, "audita examinatorum sententia" (Cap. vi, de concursu); so that it is hard to see how he could act "inconsulte" in this matter either now or previous to the end of the twenty years.

To question III there is but one obvious answer: For the validity of the act (i. e. of establishing an irremovable rectorship) the formalities required, besides the conditions *ex parte missionis* and *ex parte rectoris eligendi*, are that such act be performed "auctoritate episcopi de consilio consultorum suorum" (N. 33; see also N. 37). The announcement of this appointment may be made either in synod or out of synod; this has nothing to do with the validity of the appointment.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AT LOUVAIN.

The Holy Father pays a beautiful and well-merited tribute to the American Seminary at Louvain, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation. "Hortamur ipsius Conlegii doctores et alumnos, ut stent in fide constantes, numquam a proposito sibi fine deflectant, sed majorum vestigiis insistentes, omni ope studeant ut Americae Septentrionalis re-

giones Evangelicis praeconibus abundent," is an admonition which must needs go to the heart of every professor and student who has a true sense of the priestly vocation.

We give the document in our "Analecta" where it is, we believe, for the first time to appear in print. The five hundred, or more, alumni of the College, who are at present active in the vineyard of Christ throughout the United States, will feel an added sense of honorable pride in their Alma Mater. Canon Jules de Becker, whom the Holy Father created Domestic Prelate on this occasion, deserves the hearty congratulations of every student for the magnificent work he has done in extending the collegiate facilities of the institution since he became rector. Nor can we forget on this occasion the unselfish and efficient labors of his venerable and learned predecessor, the genial Monsignor Willemsen, who elects to spend his remaining days, with the approval of the Holy Father, in Rome, the home where every true Christian feels the peace of a Mother's affectionate guardianship. The one note of regret, echoed by everyone in the College, is the departure of Father Peter Masson, late Vice-Rector of the College, who returns to service in his diocese in America.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE JOHANNINE PASSAGE—
Chapter 5, Verse 7.

Qu. What is to be said, in view of the recent Syllabus, regarding the decision of the S. Congregation of the Inquisition in 1897, affirming the authenticity of the First Epistle of St. John 5: 7, which Biblical scholars, both Catholic and Protestant, now generally agree to consider as a spurious insertion in the Letter? The Decree remains, I suppose, in force; but it seems to contradict the attitude which the Inquisition would have to take to-day, if the same topic were brought up for decision by the Biblical Commission. Am I right?

Resp. The S. Congregation of the Inquisition does not affirm the authenticity of the passage referred to in the Decree of 1897, although a superficial examination may read such an interpretation into the Decree; and those who are disposed to criticise the action of the Holy See in such matters would prob-

ably see no other meaning in the carefully worded terms of the decision.

What the S. Congregation did say was the single word *Negative*. It affirmed or asserted nothing, but answered a question placed before its tribunal in the following exact terms: "Utrum *tuto* negari aut saltem in dubium revocari possit, esse authenticum textum S. Joannis, in epistola prima, cap. V, vers. 7, quod sic se habet: 'Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in coelo: Pater, verbum et Spiritus Sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt?'"

The question was one of discipline, not of doctrine. The term *tuto* implied a review of the evidence, furnished by the critics of the time, that the passage was not genuine; and the answer of the Holy See was simply and briefly: *No*. That is to say, the evidence thus far furnished offers no *safe ground* for teaching that the passage is not authentic, or that its authenticity is doubtful. As the late Cardinal Vaughan pointed out at the time in a letter written to Wilfrid Ward, and as was shown in the *Revue biblique* (1898, p. 149) soon after, the Inquisition had no intention of stopping the discussion of the matter, which it would have done had the decree meant any thing more than: *not proven*. Catholic scholars generally have so regarded the matter, and among them is Dr. Kuenstle, whose recent book *Das Comma Joanneum*, published with the Imprimatur of the Archbishop of Freiburg, is probably the most decided expression of opinion touching the *non*-authenticity of the passage; and if the S. Congregation were to make reply to the same question put to it ten years ago, it might readily answer *affirmative*, in view of the patristic evidence at hand, which was far from having been sufficiently sifted ten years ago, to place any dogmatic utterance of Biblical teachers on sure ground, whatever suspicions individual critics might have entertained that the passage was of Spanish interpolation and had no existence in the Vulgate before the twelfth century. The fact that Pius X has ordered a revision of the authentic Latin text would seem to confirm this view. The Church observes her times and seasons, which are not regulated by the first appearances of isolated summer swallows.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE CENSORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, and its Influence upon the Production and Distribution of Literature. A Study of the History of the Prohibitory and Expurgatory Indexes, together with some Consideration of the Effects of Protestant Censorship and of Censorship by the State. By George Haven Putnam, Litt. D. In two volumes; pp. 375 and 510. New York and London: The Knickerbocker Press. 1906—1907.

A book that treats exhaustively, and with something of critical equity and erudition, the subject of the Index, comes with peculiar opportuneness at the present time, when the continued exercise of ecclesiastical censorship by the Roman Index Congregation provokes unusually emphatic protests from those who see in it an unnecessary hindrance to the progress of modern investigation and to the spread of popular education. From the Catholic side we had not long ago an estimate of the Church's censorship by the German Jesuit Father Hilgers.[1] He deals with the question from the juridico-historical viewpoint, and furnishes Mr. Putnam with considerable pretext for criticism where he deems the Catholic Church to have been at fault; for our American author repudiates anything like religious bias and writes as a literary historian who has been especially interested for years in the bookmaking art, upon the history of which the censorship of the Index has exercised a far-reaching influence during the last three and a half centuries.

The benefit of Mr. Putnam's work as a testimony to historical truth makes itself promptly felt by the reader who has been accustomed to find the hackneyed invective of Protestant writers about the Index repeated in text-book and lecture-room, as a proof that intellectual tyranny is the inspiring principle of the system and discipline of Rome, the embodiment of which is the Inquisition. Mr. Putnam points out that the Inquisition was really an institution for the correction of immoralities and for the reform of corruption within the Church, and that the suppres-

[1] Index der Verbotenen Buecher. Pp. 639. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1904.

sion of heresy naturally and prominently came within the functions of the offices of reform. And in this our author is more broad-minded than Mr. Lea, who allows this much only for the Spanish Inquisition. Speaking of the Index in particular our author says that "the censorship of the Roman Church was not so autocratic in its principles, nor so exacting and burdensome in its methods, as was the censorship attempted by the State governments acting for the most part under Protestant influence." Of the distinctly Protestant prohibitions, under State patronage, he tells us that "there are more examples of bitter and brutal oppression than can be matched anywhere in the States controlled by the Roman Church outside of Spain." Elsewhere he bears testimony to the educational work accomplished by the Church among the masses, and to the protectorate of learning and of learned men by the Roman authorities when the reverse is to be recorded of the so-called reformed communities. Of the odd anomaly of Rome denouncing Galileo in face of the valiant efforts of Protestantism to vindicate the Copernican system Mr. Putnam disposes, by showing that Rome had no exceptional views in such matters, and that "Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans, and Protestant teachers alike placed themselves on record as in opposition to the teaching of Copernicus and of Galileo."

With an intellectual openness indicated by the above-cited opinions, Mr. Putnam gives us a record of the principal Indexes published between 1546 and 1900. In his introduction and comments he cites examples of earlier centuries, and frequently refers to decrees, edicts, pastoral briefs, etc., issued under ecclesiastical authority, which show that the Church has practically exercised literary censorship from the very first ages of her organized commonwealth. Together with this history of the policy of the Church in the matter of censorship, the author gives interesting illustrations of similar censorship exercised by the Reformed Churches and by various States; and this mostly to the disadvantage, as we have indicated above, of the latter.

The practical conclusion which our author draws from his study is, however, unfavorable to the Church. He undoubtedly admits the benefit of authoritative limitation of literary production, but he is convinced that the discriminating influences that are a hindrance and an injury to the publisher and the author whom the prohibition strikes, cannot be justified by the code of commer-

cial ethics. It is here we recognize the bias of our author, who seems to forget that the Index Congregation does not pass its verdicts without the same cautions which safeguard *bona fide* delinquents in other departments. The author who offers, and the publisher who accepts, a book which explicitly appeals to Catholics and teaches as Catholic doctrine a doctrine which the interpreting authorities of the Church would disavow, lays himself open to the charge of libel and to prosecution by that Church. Yet the Index Congregation does not sue author or publisher, but merely states publicly that her children are not to accept as her doctrine or as sound morality what she condemns. Any society has a just right to make such a statement for the protection of its members. But in the case of the Index, every author and every publisher is warned in advance that to escape the risk of such statement they need only procure the *Imprimatur* by presenting in advance their work to a *censor deputatus*, who will let them know what the publication may have to expect if it go forth on its misinforming or immoral mission without being purged.

That there have been abuses, errors, and retractions in the history of the Index Congregation is nothing that need surprise us; it is the fate of any and every judicial tribunal to issue at times reversible sentences. But to make such instances the basis of demonstration of a principle and policy in the transactions of the legislature or administrative body is going beyond the bounds of fair deduction. Mr. Putnam is occasionally led to view matters in this light, as when he intimates that the S. Congregation might at any time act upon the report and judgment of individuals, whereas the personnel and the methods of the S. Congregation have made such a course practically impossible for centuries. There are also misapprehensions to which undue prominence is given regarding the action of popes forbidding the reading of classics such as Lucian, Aristotle, Plato, Seneca; or the Scriptures when mistranslated and unexplained, or the Christian Fathers—which partiality we can only interpret by the fact that Mr. Putnam has so largely relied upon the judgment of authors like Llorente, Mendham, and Lea, whose lack of sympathy for things Catholic should be no secret to any reader of their works.

But it is not possible here to enter upon a critical controversy as to the merits of sources such as these, and our author does not deserve the reproach of having neglected the classical refer-

ence books, Catholic or otherwise, which treat of his subject. There is more than the ordinary proportion of misprints in the reproduction of documents, which misprints sometimes seriously puzzle the student who wishes to verify their meaning. Thus one wonders what "Regis Catholici Jesu et auctoritate atque Albani Ducis concilio" (p. 229) can mean, until a reference to Reusch suggests that *Jesu* should be *jussu* and *concilio* must read *consilio*. Altogether Mr. Putnam's work is an immense advance in fairness of historical treatment of a subject distinctly misunderstood by Protestants generally, and here treated wholly objectively although without sympathy for the Church.

CURSUS PHILOSOPHIAE THOMISTICAE. Vol. III: Philosophia Naturalis: Pars II: Biologia et Psychologia. Auctore Fr. Ed. Hugon, O. P. Parisiis: P. Lethielleux. 1907. Pp. 342.

SUMMULA PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE in usum adolescentium, a Rev. J. S. Hickey, O. Cist., concinnata. Vol. III (Pars II): Ethica. Dublin: Browne et Nolan. 1907. Pp. 270.

Some account of Father Hugon's Course of Thomistic Philosophy was given in the last number of the REVIEW. In the meantime the second and concluding part of the *Philosophy of Nature* has been published, the section, namely, treating of life, vegetative, sensitive, and intellective or human. If there be any gradation of importance amongst the several departments of the philosophical system, a high, and in some respects the highest, degree should be assigned to those comprised in this volume, that is, philosophical Biology and Psychology. The roots of these two branches lie, it is true, in Ontology, and are further expanded in Cosmology, but their vigor becomes most patent in the philosophy of life, human and sub-human. Those roots, it need hardly be said, are the principles constitutive of bodies. Father Hugon has discussed these principles very thoroughly and ably in the former part of the present section (Cosmology). One might desiderate some more extended treatment of the electronic hypothesis about which so much is written, wisely as well as unwisely, at the present time. The author has contented himself, unfortunately, it must be said, with the merest passing allusion to this matter. We say unfortunately, because if it should be found to be true that the hitherto supposed ultimate atoms of matter are really compound systems of other elements or cor-

puscles—electrons; and if it should turn out that these elements are really homogeneous and by their arrangements and interaction give rise to the different phenomena observable in the so-called simple chemical substances, an approach would have been made to the scholastic theory concerning the generic oneness of primal matter. An approach, indeed—nothing more; for even should it be the case that the ultimate elements of matter are homogeneous, that basal matter would nevertheless have its own substantial form differentiating it from every other at least possible, if not actual, constituent of bodies, and would not, therefore, be *prima materia* in the familiar acceptation of the term. However, if the hypothesis of homogeneity should ever be verified—and the prudent thinker should risk no adverse prophecies on the subject—the theory of matter and form would have to draw its arguments exclusively from the domain of life, as indeed some of its advocates are recently tending more and more to do. In view, therefore, of the wide interest which the new physical speculation is evoking, and in view of its at least hypothetic bearings, it must be regarded as a regrettable omission in our scholastic text-books that they pass it by practically unnoticed.

So far, however, as the positive exposition of the generally received substance of Catholic philosophy is concerned, the present *Cursus* leaves nothing to be desired, whether as to adequacy, orderliness, or lucidity. The same may be said especially in regard to the present section of the work dealing with living organized beings. The body of ascertained truth is admirably expounded. It would, however, be leaving a false impression on the reader's mind to signalize this as the sole merit of the work. Both here as well as in the preceding volume the contributions of recent physical science to philosophy are by no means disregarded. The author has made some good use of such data, especially in his treatment of the chemistry and anatomy of living organisms, and of the physiological facts and conditions of sensory phenomena. There is also a brief though lucid treatment of hypnotism and of abnormal psychoses. Having added this much of physical to metaphysical science, the author would have done well to have discussed the subject of telepathy and other allied phenomena—subjects that are just now as much in evidence, and of which an extended course of philosophy like the present might be expected to offer at least some description and explanation.

In connexion with the work thus far noticed, the reviewer would call attention to the *Summula* of Scholastic Philosophy just completed by Father Hickey, of Mt. Melleray, Ireland. The three preceding portions of the work were recommended in the REVIEW at the times of their successive publication. The present volume is occupied with ethics, general and special. The sum of traditional teaching is exhibited and unfolded with that notable solidity and clarity which we have indicated as characteristic of the former volumes. Here, too, as there, the author has drawn upon the pertinent English literature of his subject—a feature that adds so much to the practical value of a Latin textbook, and therefore commends the present work to the attention of seminary superiors who may be contemplating the introduction of a new aid to philosophical instruction.

DIE SONNTAGSEPISTELN. Von Dr. Benedictus Sauter, O. S. B. Herausgegeben von seinen Moenchen. Freiburg, Breisg. und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1907. Pp. 579.

An exposition of the Epistles usually read on Sundays to the faithful who attend Mass is a matter which calls for much more attention on the part of the pastoral clergy than is commonly given to it. The Epistles are often difficult to understand, not only because they lack that descriptive and scenic element by which the Gospel narratives appeal to the average imagination, but also because they condense abstract doctrines and enunciate mysteries in a way which makes it plain they were generally intended to have an expositor to comment upon their text. The messengers of the Apostles who carried the letters to the Christian Churches were frequently more than lectors; and they were charged with verbal instructions that might fit the occasions when these messages were read to the assembled faithful. The Church, likewise, in selecting certain portions of these writings for the liturgical service evidently wishes to harmonize the lessons contained therein with the character of the entire sacrificial and doctrinal function, so that one part may shed light upon the other. This idea of harmony needs to be brought out, for if properly interpreted the Epistles furnish many fruitful considerations of the beauty, doctrine, and moral teaching of the liturgical seasons. P. Sauter, who devoted a large portion of his useful activity to the study of this branch of catechetics, has admirably succeeded

in giving us a clear and attractive exposition of both the exegesis of the Epistles and of the relation they bear to the other parts of the liturgical service.

The method of exposition which P. Sauter uses is, moreover, calculated to bring out the sense and a variety of interpretations of a difficult passage in the Epistles. He represents the disciple as asking his master for the explanation of a text, and the latter first answers, then meets difficulties, which in turn he solves, until the whole matter becomes a panorama of related facts of faith illustrating one another. It is a work that should be translated, but translated with due regard to the genius and temper of the English language and mind.

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE. By Leon de la Brière. Authorised translation, by Meta and Mary Brown. New York: Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. 217.

FIGURES DE MARTYRS. Par Henri Chérot, S. J. Revue et augmentée par Eugene Griselle, Litt. D. Paris: Beauchesne et Cie, 17, rue de Rennes. 1907. Pp. 320.

The former of these two books contains a portrait of King Louis XV of France and his daughter Madame Louise, of whose life the volume is a sketch. The monarch, seated on a plain couch, grasps in both hands the right-hand of his daughter who stands before him. The contrast between the rich worldly attire of the man and the austere religious habit of the woman is no less striking than is the sensuous uplifted profile of the one to the modest down-bending countenance of the other. The portrait is meant to be representative. It is likewise symbolical. The contrast between the two figures suggests the difference between the two lives and their actuating principles—sottish lasciviousness and the purity begotten of self-denial. The value of the book before us lies in the fact that, whilst it explicitly tells the story of the life of Madame Louise, it implicitly illustrates the power for weal and woe of opposite moral standards. The portrayal of a noble character and of a saintly soul is the object of the book. The moral, though unforced, is too essential to escape the most casual reader. The naïve, yet withal spirited, and at times even petulant, childhood of the young princess, her unselfish maidenhood and noble womanhood, passed unscathed through the worldly gaieties and frivolities of the court, the seventeen years spent in the toil and the austerities of the Carmelite con-

vent of St. Denis—these aspects are presented in simple style, illustrated for the most part by the correspondence and written reflections of Madame Louise herself or her personal associates. Incidentally a side-light is thrown on the life of her father, who retained at least the redeeming trait of paternal affection, and was not wholly impervious to the saintly influence of his daughter.

Amongst the many deeds of charity performed by Madame Louise was that of befriending Madaleine Lidoine, a young Parisian whose parents were unable to pay the religious dowery. The girl came to St. Denis to seek the advice of Mother Teresa of St. Augustine (Madame Louise), who, approving of her vocation, induced the Dauphiness Marie Antoinette to pay the amount. Madaleine took the habit with the title of her benefactress, Sister Teresa of St. Augustine, at the Carmel of Campiègne, and when the Revolution broke out she was prioress of the convent. It was she who headed to the guillotine that noble band of virgin martyrs whom Pius X recently raised to the altar (May, 1906).

The story of these heroic religious is told in the second of the above volumes, *Figures de Martyrs*. The author spared no pains to obtain all the authentic evidence extant relative to the life and death of these witnesses to Christ, and the editor has done his part with scrupulous fidelity. The result is as graphically interesting as it is spiritually edifying. Besides the story of the Carmelite martyrs, the volume contains a no less valuable account of some other heroes and heroines sacrificed to the religious hatred of the Jacobins. There is also a sketch of the martyrdom of the three Hungarians, Canon Crisin, Pongracz, and Grodecz, the two latter members of the Society of Jesus, who shed their blood for the faith, 7 September, 1619, and were beatified 1 November, 1904. The work is enriched with numerous valuable documents and a very full bibliography.

QUISTIONI TEOLOGICO-MORALI die materie riguardanti Specialmente i tempi nostri. Per Casimiro Card. Gennari. Edizione seconda con giunte e correzioni. Deposito Generale presso la Libreria Cattolica Internazionale: Desclée, Lefebvre et Cie, Roma. Pp. 931.

The matter contained in this portly volume treats of practical

moral questions, in the manner of *casus conscientiae* proposed and answered by a competent theologian. The questions appeared originally in the Roman periodical *Il Monitore Ecclesiastico*, conducted for a number of years by the learned Casimiro Gennari, who was created Cardinal during the last years of the reign of Leo XIII. The topics are not arranged under the usual rubrication of text-books of Moral Theology, but a tabulated survey and a copious index make it easy to find the solutions of the various pastoral difficulties a priest is likely to meet with in these days, and to many of which it is impossible to obtain a prompt answer in the current manuals of theology. The selection embraces nearly seven hundred questions. Since the volume confines itself to moral topics only, the author promises to complete the work by another volume dealing with the subject of doubts regarding canon law and sacred liturgy. The book is of permanent and practical use in the cure of souls, as well as in the class-room, where it offers a great variety of illustrations regarding the application of moral principles and laws to modern conditions, especially in Italy.

STORIES OF THE GREAT FEASTS OF OUR LORD, taken from the Gospel Narrative and Tradition. By the Rev. James Butler. London and Edinburgh : Sands and Co.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1907.

If publishers of pious books for children were to adopt the style and standard of this brief collection of Gospel stories, our children would probably read more of them when not under compulsion; and what they read would make a better and more lasting impression upon their intelligence. The subject-matter is a simple narration, and the type, paper, and generous page-form are unmistakably calculated to attract and impress the child. The same is true of the illustrations, although we should in all cases for children prefer selections from the clean and natural art types of the German schools (Duesseldorf or Beuron) to the crowded and odd figures of Ghirlandajo and Botticini, which do not appeal to the modern child's mind.

Literary Chat.

Among the recent timely (penny) pamphlets issued by the London Catholic Truth Society is Father Ashton's brief essay, *Socialism and Religion.* It contains a succinct critique of Collectivism in general and sets forth in their own language the attitude of the socialistic leaders toward religion and the Church in particular. Of course it is easy enough to assert that Socialism is not anti-religious; that it is a political-economic system looking to social reform, betterment of labor conditions, banishment of poverty, and the rest. Socialism, however, must be estimated not in the abstract but in the concrete, and as such in the programs advocated by its congresses and its recognized authoritative leaders. Father Ashton judges of it from the latter viewpoint, and his judgment is calm and dispassionate. The pamphlet is one to put in the hands of wage-earners who are in danger of being beguiled by the specious utopianism of socialistic writers and speakers.

A little brochure of hardly less importance is Mr. William Matthew's *Pantheism.* Though addressed to a more restricted class than the foregoing, it meets a widely-felt want, for Monism is ubiquitous in current literature and is extremely insidious in its sophistry. Mr. Matthew knows his subject thoroughly and is happy in his method of exposition, which is popular without being trivial. Perhaps it had been just as well if he had not used an argument (at page 6) drawn from the lack of *conscious union* between the *unconscious* world and the alleged *one* of the Pantheists. It does not necessarily follow that an *undivided* personality must be *conscious* of all its (his) contents. Surely there are many unconscious elements in man's *undivided* personality.

Another of these instructive little pamphlets treats of the *Alleged Difficulties in Holy Scripture.* The principal objections urged by infidelity against the Old and New Testaments, especially on moral, historical, scientific, and literary grounds, are fairly stated and, within the limits of the modest pages, cleverly answered in a way that should convince the candid inquirer. It would be difficult to find an essay of a hundred short pages in which so much and such valuable information on so important a subject is contained.

It may not be known to all of our readers that the Catholic Truth Society of England has published a series of penny pamphlets (bound in a one-shilling volume) dealing with the *Crisis of the Church in France.* The latest additions to the list are *The Pope and the French Government, Who's to Blame?* by the Rev. Father Gerard, S. J., and *Plain Words on Church and State in France.* The latter is particularly serviceable as conveying the viewpoint of a non-Catholic. It contains the papers which ap-

peared in the *Saturday Review* for 16 August and 15 December, 1906. Amongst the other recent biographical papers published by the same Society is an interesting sketch of the *Brothers Ratisbonne*, and a no less interesting and enlightened study of *Pascal*.

Biblische Studien (XII, 4) publishes an admirable essay by Dr. Johann Hejcl, theological professor in Koeniggraetz, on the subject of "Usury among the Israelites" and the old Semitic races. He shows that the prohibition to take interest on money from Jews was essentially an Israelitish institution. Similar prohibitions are indeed to be found among the Egyptians, but there is no evidence of dependence either way. There can be no doubt that the Babylonian usury system antedates that of the Israelites, for we meet with a developed legislation on the subject much earlier in Babylon than in Palestine; nevertheless the Israelitish system is considerably older in the principles it sets forth, since it evidently presupposes a national development anterior to that of Babylonian civilization. The brochure is a valuable exposition of a legal question from the ethnological and ethical standpoints (B. Herder).

Fr. Pustet and Company publish a beautiful folio edition of the new Kyriale, which recalls the custom of surpliced Christians gathering around the lectern for the chanting of the *Ordinarium Missae*.

The International Catholic Library, edited by the Rev. Dr. Wilhelm (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.), is doing creditable work in the translations which it is publishing, particularly from the French. One of the most interesting of its latest issues is a collection of Letters of the Countess de Saint Martial, who afterwards became Sister Blanche in the Order of Vincentian nuns. Hers is the story of a beautiful young Protestant girl marrying a somewhat worldly Catholic nobleman, whose religion she studies, then makes him live up to it, and finally, after his death, she adopts his faith with a fervor that leads to the perfect self-denial of the religious life.

The Rev. Spencer Jones, in a Preface to *The Prince of the Apostles* (The Lamp Publishing Co.), writes with a strong note of conviction and sound reason in behalf of the reunion of Christendom. The volume itself also contains several chapters from his pen, whilst the main portion is the work of the editor of *The Lamp*, an Anglo-Roman monthly devoted to Church unity. The arguments are well-selected from Scripture and history to show that the only reasonable course of the sincere inquirer after evangelical truth lies in the direction of submission to the doctrines and discipline of the See of Peter. It is a remarkable plea of what the author calls the legitimate continuity of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* of Saxon and Norman times. The authors accept the dogmas of 1854 and 1870; the latter in the sense in which Newman interprets its meaning rather than in the terms of rigid comprehensiveness which Manning gave to the idea of Papal Infallibility.

Paul Allard's *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs* (Benziger Brothers) is an admirable illustration of the author's earlier apologetical works. It is particularly timely also as giving us a vivid historical picture of the strenuous life of the Primitive Church, thus affording a salutary contrast to the self-indulgent aspects of modern Christianity in the very midst of perpetual struggle for secular advancement. The translation is well done, and there is an instructive preface by Mgr. Péchenard, rector of the Catholic University of Paris.

Thoughts and Fancies, by Dr. Kolbe, is a pretty collection of lyrics, sonnets, and sacred thoughts, original or translated, all of which, even when they sing only secular themes, have a spiritual suggestiveness about them that refines. The Virgin's Lullaby, Animula mea, Graves in the Wilderness, The Little Shroud, Via Crucis—Via Lucis, are the simple utterances of a heart that sees God's image everywhere, in man and things. Probably the Album verses "To Stella" express this thought concretely:

Stella thy name—a name of light!
Let the light shine!
Grace-endowed with the radiance bright
Of the life divine,
Send it abroad in a world of night,
Yet keep it thine.

In the matter of books for meditation, tastes and intellectual prepossession cause much variety of preference. Probably most persons benefit by an occasional change of spiritual diet, especially in these days of dyspeptic prostration. What strikes us as an attractive health food for the soul's breakfast table, in seminary and rectory, is Father Branchereau's *Meditations for the Use of Seminarians and Priests.* It is freely translated and avoids those specialties of exclusively French genius to which one must get accustomed before he can like them.

Books Received.

SCRIPTURAL.

Der Knecht Gottes in Isaias Kap. 40-55. Von Dr. Franz Feldmann, a. o. Prof. der Theol. an der Univ. Bonn. Freiburg und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1907. Pp. viii—206. Price, $1.65.

Psallite Sapienter. Erklärung der Psalmen im Geiste des betrachtenden Gebets und der Liturgie. Von Dr. Maurus Wolter, O. S. B. III Edit. Band V (completing the work with Index). Freiburg und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1907. Pp. 565. Price, $2.45.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

Dissertatio de Sanctitate Matrimonii Vindicata contra Onanismum quam Illmus et Rmus. D. Fr. Maurus Bernardus Nardi, Ordinis Franciscalium Capuccinorum, Episcopus Tit. Thebanus, ac Doctor in S. Theologia

et Jure Canonico concinnavit. Editio Tertia diligentius emendata, atque pluribus aucta. Romae: Desclée, Lefebvre et Socii. 1907. Pp. 380. Pretium, 4 *l.*

THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By Mgr. E. Le Camus, Bishop of La Rochelle, France; translated by the Rev. William A. Hickey, Priest of the Diocese of Springfield. Vol. II. New York: The Cathedral Library Association. 1907. Pp. xviii—499. Price, $1.50; by mail, $1.64.

DE FREQUENTI QUOTIDIANAQUE COMMUNIONE ad normam decreti "Sacra Tridentina Synodus." Per R. P. D. Petrus Bastien, O. S. B. Accedunt variae appendices praecipua documenta continentes. Romae: Desclée, Lefebvre et Soc. 1907. Pp. xiii—240. Prezzo, 2 *l.* 80.

QUISTIONI TEOLOGICO-MORALI di Materie riguardanti specialmente i tempi nostri. Per Casimiro Card. Gennari. Edizione seconda con giunte e correzioni. Roma: Desclée, Lefebvre e Cia. Pp. xxxii—931. Prezzo, 8 *l.*

THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ELEMENTA ex S. Thoma aliisque probatis Doctoribus collegit ordineque disposuit A. J. J. F. Haine, S. S. Praelatus Domesticus, Eccl. Metrop. Mechl., Can. Hon., in Univ. Cath. Lov. S. Theol. Doctor et Prof., etc. Editio quinta, novis curis expolita et juxta recentiora decreta S. Sedis emendata, opera et studio R. P. J. Bund, Cong. SS. Cordium vulgo de Picpus, S. Th. Doct. Tomus I—Continens Tractatus: de Actibus humanis; de Conscientia; de Legibus; de Peccatis; de Virtutibus; de Praeceptis Decalogi et Ecclesiae. Pp. 568. II—Continens Tractatus: de Justitia et Jure; de Contractibus; de Statibus Particularibus; de Sacramentis in Genere. Pp. 556. III—Continens Tractatus: de Eucharistia; de Poenitentia; de Extrema Unctione; de Ordine. Pp. 528. IV—Continens Tractatus: de Matrimonio; de Indulgentiis et Jubilaeo; de Irregularitatibus; de Poenis Canonicis; Appendices. Pp. 571. Parisiis: P. Lethielleux; Romae: Fr. Pustet et Soc. 1907.

TRIBUTES OF PROTESTANT WRITERS to the Truth and Beauty of Catholicity. By James J. Treacy. Fourth Edition. Ratisbon, Rome, New York, Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1907. Pp. 383. Price, $1.00.

FORTY-FIVE SERMONS, written to meet the Objections of the Present Day. By the Rev. James McKernan. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1907. Pp. 291.

CONQUESTS OF OUR HOLY FAITH, or Testimonials of Distinguished Converts. By James J. Treacy. Third edition. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1907. Pp. 473. Price, $1.00.

A TUSCAN PENITENT. The Life and Legend of St. Margaret of Cortona. By Father Cuthbert, Capuchin. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd.; New York: Benziger Brothers. 1907. Pp. 291. Price, $1.35.

SURSUM CORDA. Letters of the Countess de Saint Martial, in religion Sister Blanche, Sister of Charity of St. Vincent of Paul. Together with a Brief Biographical Memoir by her Brother Baron Leopold de Fischer. Authorized translation from the French. With two portraits. New York and Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers. 1907. Pp. 335. Price, $2.00.

MEDITATIONS FOR THE USE OF SEMINARIANS AND PRIESTS. By the Rev. L. Branchereau, S. S. Vol. I.—Fundamental Truths. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1907. Pp. 252. Price, $1.00.

SERMONS TO NOVICES REGULAR. By Thomas à Kempis. Authorized translation from the text of the edition of Michael Joseph Pohl, Ph. D., by Dom Vincent Scully, C. R. L. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1907. Pp. 255. Price, $1.35.

STORIES OF THE GREAT FEASTS OF OUR LORD. Taken from Gospel Narratives and Tradition. By the Rev. James Butler. London and Edinburgh: Sands & Co.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1907. Pp. 94. Price, $0.85.